

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town 26s.; Country, 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s.

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

## The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, NOVEMBER 18, 1876.

### CURRENT TOPICS.

WE UNDERSTAND that Mr. Whitley Stokes, secretary to the Legislative Department of the Government of India, will succeed Mr. Arthur Hobhouse, Q.C., as legal member of the Supreme Council of India.

SEVEN OUT OF THIRTEEN JUDGES have decided that the conviction in *The Franconia* case shall be quashed. The facts of the case will be in the remembrance of our readers. Briefly stated they were these:—Captain Kuhn, the master of *The Franconia*, a German vessel, managed his ship with such gross carelessness that she came into collision with an English vessel, *The Strathclyde*, within two miles of our coast, sunk her, and Jessie Dorcas Young, a passenger in *The Strathclyde*, and a British subject, was drowned. Captain Kuhn was tried at the Old Bailey for manslaughter, and was convicted. His counsel took objection to the jurisdiction of the court, on the grounds that the prisoner was a foreigner, and that the act was done on the seas and on board a foreign vessel, not availing itself of the hospitality of England, but passing from one foreign port to another. Against this view it was contended by the Crown that, inasmuch as at the time of the collision both vessels were within the distance of three miles from the English shore, the offence was committed within the realm of England, and was triable by the English courts. There was also a subsidiary contention on the part of the Crown that the person injured was on board an English ship at the time when she received the injury, and that, in fact, the offence was committed on board an English ship. On the hearing before the Court of Criminal Appeal, the majority of the judges (Cockburn, C.J., Kelly, C.B., Bramwell, J.A., Sir R. Phillimore, Lush, J., Pollock, B., and Field, J.) held that, though a State had dominion within the distance of three miles from low watermark, yet that such a dominion was merely for purposes of defence and security, and did not warrant the assumption of criminal jurisdiction in respect of peaceable foreign vessels passing over those waters. Of the minority Lord Coleridge, C.J., and Denman, J., decided for the Crown on both the points raised, viz., as to the three miles being within the jurisdiction, and also as to the act having been committed on board a British vessel, whilst Brett, J.A., and Amphlett, B., founded their judgments on the first point alone. Grove, J., held that either point was sufficient to sustain a conviction, and Lindley, J., elected to rest his opinion on the question of jurisdiction within the three-mile zone, at the same time expressing the view that there was some judicial authority for the contention that the act was done on board a British vessel, though he did not feel satisfied on the matter.

We cannot pretend to decide between these conflicting judgments, but we may point out that, as to the first point, it was admitted on all hands that the State has jurisdiction within the three-mile zone, and

that this jurisdiction has been granted by the consensus of nations for the protection and security of the adjacent State. May it not, then, with some reason, be said that this jurisdiction will exist to little effect if it have not the sanction of the criminal law? With respect to the other point, that the act was committed on board an English vessel, a correspondent of the *Times* has cited a case which he seems to think settles this matter, and, indeed, the whole question. "Nearly 100 years ago a man firing from the shore killed another 100 yards off at sea. The question arose whether the offence was committed at sea or on land; if at sea, it came under the admiralty jurisdiction; if on land, it was triable at the county assizes. It was held that the offender should be tried by the admiralty jurisdiction, for the offence was committed where the death happened, and not at the place from whence the cause of death proceeded" (*Coombes' case*, 1 Leach, 388). If this precedent is valid, "C." says, it ought to govern *The Franconia* case, and as the offence was committed on board the English ship run down, and not on board the German ship, "C." concludes that Kuhn is liable to our law without any reference to the three miles limit. The case does not really touch the point, for there the offence was begun and completed at the same moment, in the same place, and under the same jurisdiction. The shot took effect, and the man died, on board an English ship. In the present case, Jessie Dorcas Young did not die on board an English ship, but was thrown overboard and drowned. We are therefore driven back to the original position: have we jurisdiction over that portion of the seas where Jessie Dorcas Young died? It appears to have been doubtful at common law whether, when a man died in one county of a stroke received in another, the offence could be considered as having been completely committed in either county (2 Hawk. P. C. c. 25, s. 36; 1 East, P. C. c. 5, s. 128, p. 361). Of the two things—the stroke and the death—which occurred in different jurisdictions, the death seems to have been regarded as the more important; and *Coombes' case* certainly cannot be taken to have decided that the place of the stroke only need be regarded.

ALLUDING ON A FORMER OCCASION to the "Judicial Statistics," we said that those for the year 1875-6 (the first complete year of the operation of the Judicature Acts) would be looked forward to with unusual interest, and, in now reverting to the subject, we are tempted to repeat the wish then expressed, viz., that the returns for that year, relating to the business of the official departments attached to the several divisions of the High Court of Justice, could be accessible, in some form or other, sooner than the whole volume of the "Judicial Statistics" is usually published. However, those returns are now, doubtless, in course of preparation, and we venture to express the hope that they will be as uniform as possible throughout the divisions. The business in some at least of the official departments is similar in its nature, and the returns from those departments might, therefore (it is assumed), be similar in form, and thus furnish full and complete information respecting that business. We instance one item in illustration. The district registries have largely divided the issue of writs. Now, the district registrars will, of course, furnish returns showing the number of actions commenced in the High Court by writs issued from their respective registries. But very many of such actions have been transferred or removed to London, and it may become interesting to know how many have been thus transferred or removed. It will, however, be impossible to ascertain this, unless all the officers in London having charge of the "cause books" furnish information on the point. Suppose, for instance, that the returns to be furnished by the Clerks of Records and Writs shall (amongst other things) show the number of actions which, commenced by writ in district registries, and attached to the Chan-

very Division of the High Court, have been transferred or removed to London, while the returns to be furnished by other similar official departments are silent with reference to such actions transferred to them? It is manifest that, in such a case, the statistical information in reference to transferred actions would be incomplete, and, for practical purposes, useless. Of course, the like undesirable result might happen if, in any return giving information respecting transferred actions, no clear distinction be made between actions transferred from district registries and actions simply transferred from one division of the court to another. The matter is thus alluded to at the present time, in the hope that the suggested uniformity may not escape the notice of heads of departments, and that they will, wherever practicable, act in concert in compiling their respective returns. Even interchange between them of copies of the respective forms of returns proposed to be used might suggest uniformity and consequent completeness, in respect at least of items of business common to two or more departments. We should be glad if this practical suggestion could be put authoritatively before the heads of departments, for we believe that returns prepared as proposed would tend to lessen the labours of the compilers of the Judicial Statistics, and insure more complete and more reliable and useful information to the profession and the public.

WE ARE GLAD TO OBSERVE that the benchers of the Middle Temple have resolved to institute eight scholarships, to be awarded annually to students of that society, we presume on the results of examination in various branches of law. The total annual sum to be devoted to the scholarships is the same as that contemplated by the scheme promulgated last year by the Inner Temple; but instead of founding six scholarships of one hundred guineas each, the Middle Temple propose to establish four of one hundred guineas, and four of fifty guineas. We hope that the condition which the Inner Temple attached to their scholarships—that the 100 guineas should be paid to some pleader or barrister, “to be approved by the treasurer or education committee,” “to whose chambers the student shall go for the purpose of studying the law”—will be discarded from the scheme of the Middle Temple. The men who win studentships are nearly certain to read in chambers, and it cannot be doubted that they would rather choose their own barristers or pleaders, and pay the fee for themselves, than be apprenticed by the benchers. It remains to be seen what Lincoln's-inn will do in the way of encouraging the improvement of legal education.

AT THE MANSION HOUSE on Wednesday last two men were charged before Sir Robert Carden with attempting to pick pockets in Cheapside. The prisoners' counsel submitted that, as the prosecutor had nothing in his pocket to lose, the prisoners could not be convicted of an attempt to steal. But the magistrate held otherwise, and observed “that he had once convicted a man for putting back into a pocket a handkerchief he had taken.” The case Sir Robert cites is scarcely in point. To convict a man for “putting back a handkerchief which he had taken” is something very different from convicting a man for not taking anything at all, which was the question in the recent case, and which seems to be disposed of by *The Queen v. Collins* (12 W. R. 886). There it was held that, if a person puts his hand into the pocket of another with intent to steal what he can find there, and the pocket is empty, he cannot be convicted of an attempt to steal. There can, in fact, only be an attempt to commit a felony where, if there had been no interruption of the attempt, the felony which it was attempted to commit could have been effected. “If,” says Chief Justice Cockburn in the case we have

just cited, “a man, finding the door open, goes into a room where goods are generally kept, intending to steal, and no goods happen to be there, and he finds nothing, in that case no larceny could be committed, and therefore he could not be convicted of attempting to steal the goods.” If *The Queen v. Collins* be law (and we are not aware the principle there laid down has ever been overruled) it is pretty clear that the decision of Sir R. Carden, assuming that his judgment has been correctly reported, cannot be sustained.

#### SALE OF CHATELS SETTLED AS HEIR-LOOMS.

THERE must be many cases in which the tenant for life of a settled estate would be glad to get rid of the trouble and expense of preserving chattels devolving with the estate as heirlooms, to say nothing of the cases in which the tenant for life would like to turn them into property producing income. The affection for pictures or furniture which a life spent among them may have called forth in a testator is, unfortunately, not transmissible along with the articles themselves; and it must often happen that their temporary owner, or perhaps more correctly their temporary guardian, eyes them with disgust when he thinks that, if they could only be sold, they would produce enough to buy this snug little farm, or to pay off that troublesome mortgage. To all such persons, happening also to be readers of the *Law Reports*, a decision of Vice-Chancellor Malins (*Fane v. Fane*, L. R. 2 Ch. D. 711) must have appeared like a bright lamp in the dark. In that case the Vice-Chancellor, on a petition by a tenant for life, ordered settled chattels to be sold for the purpose of paying off mortgages on the real estate, “the court being of opinion that it would be for the benefit of all parties that they should be sold.” As a precedent for this order, the learned judge referred to an unreported case of *Vansittart v. Vansittart*, decided by himself a couple of months previously, in which he held that he had jurisdiction to order the sale of heirlooms. Subsequently to these decisions, but, if we may judge from the form of the prayer, not with very confident expectation that they would be followed, the tenant for life of a property settled by the will of a testator whose estate was being administered by the court, presented a petition at the Rolls asking for a sale of the chattels devolving with the estate, or, in the alternative, that leave might be given to the petitioner to take proceedings, at the expense of the estate, in order to obtain a private Act of Parliament authorizing such sale (see the report *D'Eyncourt v. Gregory*, 25 W. R. 6).

The case made by the petitioner was much stronger than that made in *Fane v. Fane*, and indeed was as strong a case as is reasonably conceivable. The testator had built a magnificent mansion on an estate of which he was only tenant for life, and had furnished it with a most extensive collection of works of art. His wish was that this estate and certain fee simple property of his own should devolve together, and, in order to induce subsequent tenants in tail of the settled estate to re-settle it so as to go with his own property, he inserted a shifting clause in his will, by the operation of which, in the event which had happened—namely, the refusal of a tenant in tail to re-settle—the testator's own estate, together with the collection of works of art, went over to the petitioner as tenant for life. The house on this last-mentioned estate was not in any way suitable for such an assemblage of articles; they crowded out the petitioner from the enjoyment of his residence; the annual expense of preserving them nearly equalled the annual value of the estate; and, notwithstanding every care, some of them were deteriorating in value. In fact, as we have said, a stronger case for a sale could hardly be imagined. The Master of the Rolls, however, held that he had no power

to order a sale, or, as he put it, to make a new will for the testator. The petitioner was told that he might apply for an Act, which would provide for the costs of obtaining it; and it was intimated that if the Act could not be obtained application for the costs incurred might be made in the suit.

There can be no doubt that the more recent decision is the correct one. The law empowers a man to tie up chattels for a certain period, and there are no statutory provisions, such as those made by the Settled Estates Acts in respect of land, enabling the courts to sell chattels so tied up. Indeed, the general scheme of those Acts, which provide mainly for the substitution of other hereditaments for those sold, would be inapplicable to settled chattels, and if attempted to be applied to them would too painfully remind one of the Roman general, Mummian, who, on shipping to Italy some of the most exquisite examples of Greek art, exacted securities from the masters of the vessels to replace, by an equivalent, any picture or statue lost or injured on the passage. It may be remarked, too, that a sale of heirlooms quietly ordered on a petition day would contrast very unfavourably with the elaborate system of precautions, such as advertisements, &c., provided by Parliament in the case of settled lands, although the beneficial interests of the remainder men in the case of chattels would, it is obvious, be more affected by a sale than they could be in the case of land. For if the settled chattels were sold and their produce invested in land, their value would not vest absolutely in a tenant in tail, so as to be his without the execution of a disentailing deed, as the chattels themselves if unsold would have done.

It appears, then, from the recent case, that, except when wanted for the payment of debts, the court cannot order the sale of chattels which are subject to limitations valid at law. A settlement of chattels cannot, of course, withdraw them from liability to be sold for payment of the debts of the settlor; or, as Lord Eldon put it in the case of *Clarke v. The Earl of Ormonde* (1 Jac. 108), "no testator can in any way exempt any part of the personal estate from applicability to the payment of his debts, nor can he put into the hands of his executors the means of defending themselves at law." But, as is shown by that case, it is the duty of the executors to carry out an intention of settling chattels as far as they can, and once such chattels are past the risk of being sold to pay debts, then, so far as the courts are concerned, they are (or rather, having regard to *Fane v. Fane* and *Vansittart v. Vansittart*, they ought to be) safe for the period during which they can legally be tied up. They are, as Lord Eldon says in the case already referred to, "a kind of property that is rather a favourite of the courts."

The Crown paper in the Court of Queen's Bench on Wednesday, the 15th inst., being exhausted by two o'clock, and there being some difficulty in finding work for the court to proceed with, Mellor and Lush, JJ., stated that, until further orders, whenever any special paper comes to an end during the course of the day, the court will take the new trial paper.

On Friday, the 10th inst., at a full parliament of the masters of the bench of the Middle Temple, the treasurer, Mr. Powell, Q.C., in the chair, it was resolved unanimously that, in addition to the sums now voted annually by the society for purposes of legal education, there should be established four scholarships of 100 guineas each, and four scholarships of fifty guineas each, to be awarded annually to students of that society, subject to such regulations as a committee of the benchers should recommend, and should be approved of by the parliament. We understand it is proposed that the subjects for which the scholarships will be awarded should be jurisprudence and civil law, equity, real and personal property, and common law, and that the regulations will be framed with the object of stimulating the students generally to compete for the scholarships.

## THE WORK OF THE COURTS IN THE LAST YEAR OF THE OLD SYSTEM.

### II.—THE COURT OF CHANCERY.

In the High Court of Chancery the total number of proceedings for hearing at the beginning of 1874-75 was 498 against 724 at the commencement of the previous twelve months. There were set down for hearing during the year 2,556 cases, 2,316 having been heard during the year, and 271 having been otherwise disposed of, leaving 467 cases as *remanets* at the end of the year. In 1873-74, 2,486 causes were set down for hearing, and 2,306 were heard. The registrar's return shows that 14,467 orders were made, that there were 3,915 certificates for sale, or transfer, or delivery of stock or other securities, and that 1 case stood for judgment at the end of the year. The Lord Chancellor, together with the Lords Justices, sat on 32 days, the Lords Justices alone on 123 days, the Master of the Rolls on 170 days, and the three Vice-Chancellors 172, 149, and 169 days respectively, giving 815 as the total number of days of sitting in court against 828 in 1873-74. Further, the Lord Chancellor sat to hear appeals in the House of Lords on 59 days, and 8 days on committees of privilege; and he also sat on 4 days on the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. On the same committee Lord Justice James sat on 5 days, and Lord Justice Mellish on 4 days. Vice-Chancellor Bacon, in addition to his other sittings, sat as Chief Judge in Bankruptcy on 26 days.

In 1874-75, 130 causes, &c., were transferred by the Lord Chancellor and the Master of the Rolls, and 436 cases were referred to the conveyancing counsel of the court, against 439 in the preceding year. The number of orders drawn up in the Registrars' Office was 15,354, and the amount of fees collected thereon by stamps was £17,656. In 1873-74 the number of orders was 15,064, and the amount of fees £17,226.

The returns of the chief clerks show that the number of summonses to originate proceedings in the chambers of the Master of the Rolls and of the three Vice-Chancellors was 1,060, against 902 in 1873-74. The number of other summonses was 28,791, against 27,052. There were 10,502 orders of the class drawn up by the registrars, and 9,561 of the class drawn up in chambers; 2,761 orders, for other purposes than for the winding up of companies, were brought into chambers for prosecution, and 138 were brought in for the winding up of companies. There were 11,428 debts claimed, the amount of debts proved having been £3,383,883. The number of accounts, other than receivers' accounts, passed, was 1,946; the receipts therein amounted to £7,529,988, and the disbursements and allowances therein to £1,868,963. Under orders of court, 799 estates, realizing £3,146,295, were sold; and 136 estates were purchased. The number of certificates filed was 3,079; and the number of appointments disposed of, 80,180. At the date of the return there were pending 4,773 orders for inquiries and accounts, and 783 orders for the winding up of companies. The total fees collected by stamps in chambers during the year were £15,136, against £14,613 in 1873-74.

The returns furnished by the Clerks of Records and Writs show that 3,993 suits were instituted, against 3,409 in the previous year. The total number of proceedings was 112,734 in 1875, against 101,397 in 1874; and the total fees were £34,920, against £32,922.

In the Report Office 15,807 documents were filed, and 21,579 copied. There were 11,683 searches on which no fees were payable, and 1,126 on which fees were paid. The attendances on which no fees were payable numbered 551, and those on which fees were payable, 5. The total fees received amounted to £3,110. The examiner's return shows that 466 witnesses, against 445 in 1874, were examined, and that £382 was received in fees by stamps.

The Lord Chancellor's principal secretary's return shows that the number of attendable petitions in



1874-75 was 1,887, against 1,773 in 1873-74. There were also last year 5 petitions to the Lord Chancellor for orders of course under the exception made by Order of Court of 23rd of February, 1850, against 7 in 1873-74. Of the petitions presented in 1874-75, 16 were for hearing before the Lord Chancellor, and 109 for hearing before the Lords Justices.

The petitions set down for hearing at the Rolls were 609 in number, against 583 in 1873-74; and 4,937 petitions for orders of course were also presented, against 4,676 in the previous year.

The taxing masters' returns show that there were 3,977 references for taxation, against 3,937 in 1873-74; that 8,208, against 8,120, bills were taxed; and that 3,454, against 3,445, certificates and *allocators* were made. The fees received in the offices were £30,954, against £31,698 in 1873-74; and the amount of costs taxed was £1,057,674, against £1,072,288.

In the office of the masters in lunacy there were 123 orders for inquiry executed by the masters, and 255 reports made to the Lord Chancellor. In the office of the registrar in lunacy, 220 petitions were presented for hearing, and 125 commissions issued. There also 431 other orders made, besides 61 in pursuance of the Lunacy Regulation Act, 1862.

The return of the Assistant Paymaster-General for chancery business deals with the twelve months ending 1st September, 1875, and shows that in 1874-75 £19,907,479 was paid into, and £18,020,752 out of, court, against £20,953,398 and £19,849,200 respectively in 1873-74. The number of cheques signed was 49,593; 4,629 powers of attorney were issued; and the number of accounts was 32,687. The balance of stocks and securities on the various accounts was £64,639,854, the balance of cash £4,590,890, and the debt due from the Consolidated Fund to the suitors £2,423,340. Of the cash balance £1,012,942 was in the bank, and £1,151,142 in the hands of the National Debt Commissioners.

In the County Palatine of Lancaster Chancery Court, the number of suits and matters originated was 324, against 322 in 1873-74. The number of decrees and orders made by the registrar was 1,493, against 1,560 in the previous year; and the amount of stock and cash paid into and out of court was £455,517 and £462,522, against £583,805 and £462,984 respectively in 1873-74.

### III.—COURTS OF ADMIRALTY, PROBATE, &c.

In making the returns relating to the Court of Admiralty the registrar calls attention to the fact that the period for which they are made comprises ten months of 1875, including the whole of the long vacation, and that this should be remembered in making a comparison with the returns of former year. The number of causes pending at the commencement of the first ten months of 1875 was 197, and 285 causes were instituted during the year, the amount for which they were entered having been £927,860, against £1,625,480 in respect of a total of 501 causes in 1874. In the Liverpool district registry there were 53 causes, against 68; and the amounts for which they were entered were respectively £81,035 and £127,550. The number of motions heard in the High Court of Admiralty was 307, against 533 in 1874. Of these 61 were opposed, 15 were unopposed, and 331 were in chambers. In the Liverpool district registry 7 motions were opposed, and 16 summonses, against 34 in 1874, were issued. In the principal registry there were 159 final judgments, against 186 in 1874; and at Liverpool 10, against 12.

In the Court for Divorce and Matrimonial Causes in 1875, up to the 31st of October, there were 496 petitions filed, against 511 in 1874. There were also 209 petitions for alimony, against 214 filed in the previous year; and 785 motions and 992 summonses, against 1,030 and 837 respectively in 1874. The judgments given numbered 257, against 364; the applications for a new trial 1, against 2; the petitions dismissed 23, against 34; the decrees *nisi* 194, against 284; the decrees absolute 173,

against 194; the decrees for judicial separation 19, against 36; the decrees for restitution of conjugal rights 7, against 4; and the decrees for nullity of marriage 4, against 7 in 1874.

In the Court of Probate the number of probates granted in 1875 was 10,098, and of administrations 4,841, the numbers for 1874 having been 11,454 and 5,237 respectively. Of these 43 were granted on hearing of causes, 267 on motion, and 3 on summonses. The value of the effects sworn was under £61,876,758 for the ten months, against £67,027,730 for the whole of 1874. In the district registries 17,155 probates and 7,966 letters of administration were granted, and these together were sworn under £50,724,522.

In the ecclesiastical courts in 1875 the number of suits was 20, against 22 in 1874. There were also 267 suits for faculties, against 256 in the previous year.

### IV.—PRIVY COUNCIL AND HOUSE OF LORDS.

The return made by the registrar of the Privy Council shows that, in 1875, 104 appeals were entered, against 80 in 1874; that 35 were dismissed for non-prosecution, and that 89 were heard and determined. The appeals lodged since the 1st of April, 1870, which remained for hearing on the 1st of January, 1876, numbered 109.

In the House of Lords 42 petitions of appeal were presented, of which 6 were withdrawn and 6 dismissed for want of prosecution. In 1875, 25 judgments were delivered, and 47 causes were heard during the session. The total number of effective causes remaining for hearing at the end of the session was 13, against 24 at the close of the previous one. The amount of fees was £1,804 12s., against £1,350 8s. 6d. in 1874.

### V.—COURTS OF BANKRUPTCY.

The report of the Comptroller in Bankruptcy for 1875 states that, as compared with 1874, the number of cases administered under the several provisions of the Bankruptcy Act shows a decrease of 30. The number of resolutions for liquidation by arrangement decreased by 207; the number of adjudications of bankruptcy increased by 35; and the number of resolutions for composition with creditors registered increased by 142. In 1875, there were 965 adjudications of bankruptcy, 4,233 liquidations by arrangement, and 2,691 compositions; making together a total of 7,889 cases administered. The liabilities amounted to £25,533,644, against £20,136,670 in 1874; and the assets to £7,332,779, against £5,431,848. The number of discharges granted to bankrupts during the year was 67, of which 2 only, against 4 in 1874, were granted on the ground that the bankrupt had, or might have, paid 10s. in the pound. The total number of estates pending on the 31st of December, 1875, was 3,191; and in 98 of these pending cases the trustees cannot be found. The number of reports made by the comptroller on the conduct of trustees during the year was 446. In 228 cases the trustees complied before the hearing of the summonses; in 181, orders were made against the trustees, 162 of which have been complied with; in 30, the trustee could not be served; and 7 cases were pending at the end of the year. Among 552 estates, with assets, wound up in 1874, there were only 10 with assets exceeding £2,000. In 471 estates closed in 1875 there were 20 such estates. During the year there were in the London court and in the county courts 3,814 debtor's summonses issued, 184 declarations of inability filed by debtors, 1,526 petitions for adjudication filed, and 965 debtors adjudicated bankrupt. In 1875 there were 932 first meetings of creditors held to appoint trustees and committees of inspection, and in 880 of these cases trustees were appointed. The number of bankruptcies annulled was 24, and in 28 cases the bankruptcies were carried on by registrars as trustees. The total number of discharges granted was 67, against 82 in 1874. The summary of receipts and payments shows that the balances at the beginning of the year amounted to £346,761, and the receipts and advances by trustees,



less payments to secured creditors, &c., to £651,984. The re-payments of advances and sundry payments, including dividends, were £498,844; and the balances at the end of 1875, £499,865.

Under the heading of liquidations by arrangement it is shown that 8,388 petitions were filed, 4,233 resolutions were registered, and that there were 1,514 resolutions for discharge. The gross amount of debts was £12,483,999, the gross value of estate £4,598,473, and the gross amount of stamp duty £24,471. Under the heading of composition with creditors, it is stated that 2,691 resolutions were registered, the gross amount of debts being £6,068,405, the gross value of estate £1,773,551, and the gross amount of stamp duty £11,111.

The number of appeals presented to the Court of Appeal in Chancery was 109, 10 having been also pending on the 31st of December, 1874. The number of judgments affirmed was 47, of those reversed 21, and of those varied 7. There remained pending 27 cases, and 17 were withdrawn and arranged. To the Chief Judge in Bankruptcy 118 appeals were presented, 15 being also pending from the previous year. 44 judgments were affirmed, 51 reversed, and 5 varied, 7 appeals were remitted, 17 were withdrawn and arranged, and 9 were pending on 31st of December. The number of bills taxed was 15,196, and the gross amount of bills £391,813, of which £64,545 was taxed off.

## Reviews.

### JUDGES' CHAMBERS.

THE PRACTICE AT THE JUDGES' CHAMBERS, QUEEN'S BENCH, COMMON PLEAS, AND EXCHEQUER DIVISIONS, AND IN THE DISTRICT REGISTRIES, UNDER THE SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACTS OF 1873, 1875, AND OTHER STATUTES, &c., &c. By WILLIAM E. COE, Principal Clerk to the Hon. Mr. Justice Lush. H. Sweet.

We cannot say much for Mr. Coe's book. He arranges under various heads the sections, rules, and orders relating to chamber practice, appending occasional notes, and professing to give reports of, or references to, decisions relating to the rules and orders. The extent to which this has been done may be judged of from the fact that to ord. 16, r. 17, there is not appended a report of, or reference to, a single case; that in the note to r. 18 of that order there is no report of, or reference to, *Treleven v. Bray* (24 W. R. 198, 20 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 112); and that on ord. 52, r. 3 (detention, preservation, or inspection of property the subject of an action), the only reference is to *Cooper v. Ince Hall Company*. The purport of *Flower v. Lloyd* (20 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 703) is indeed stated; but the reference to the case appears to have been dropped. In the note to ord. 12, r. 6 (r. 5, February, 1876), the case of *Johnson v. Whitehead* is gravely cited thus:—"Notice of appearance given to a London agent of plaintiff's solicitor held sufficient." Surely Mr. Coe must know that *Johnson v. Whitehead* was decided under the annulled rule, and that the new rule expressly provides that such notice shall be given "to the plaintiff's solicitor, either by notice in writing served in the ordinary way at the address for service within the district of the district registry, or by prepaid letter directed to such address." As to the character of the explanatory notes appended to the sections, we need not do more than quote the note given to ord. 54, rr. 2, 2a (powers of masters), which is as follows:—"The masters had, by virtue of the *Regula Generales* of Michaelmas Term, 1867, made in pursuance of the 30 & 31 Vict. c. 68, the Judges' Chambers (Despatch of Business) Act, substantially the same powers before the passing of the Judicature Act. There are, however, several things the masters may now do by consent, which before they were unable to do." The Acts and rules are printed at the end of the book.

## General Correspondence.

### COSTS.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—In your issue of September 30, there are some remarks on the diverse views taken by different masters as to items of costs. Those remarks were called forth by a difference of opinion existing between Master Benett, of the Common Pleas, and Master Hodgson, of the Queen's Bench, on the subject of an allowance of 1s. or 1s. 4d. for copy writ for service. This seems a trifling matter enough, but it is in reality not so; at least, the general evil is a great one. Now I am a long way off, and they say "lookers on see most of the game," and I propose to try in this letter to point out what a curse your present system of costs is, quite as much so to the public as to the profession. There are plenty of gentlemen amongst the solicitors who are quite able, if they have the time, and will take the trouble to think about the matter, to suggest, and insist upon the adoption of, such measures as would considerably ameliorate matters.

Costs are, as every one knows, divided into two classes: costs between solicitor and client, and between party and party. The former are intended to be the solicitor's fair remuneration for the work done by him; the second, the successful party's fair indemnity. At present let us look at the first sort. And to commence with, why should there be any restriction at all on the amount which may be paid to a solicitor by a client for services rendered? Why, if a man is at the top of the profession, should his charges be limited by law to the exact amount which a boy just admitted is allowed to charge? Why, I say, this distinction between the business of a solicitor and the business of any one else? A physician may refuse business unless his ideas on the subject of fees are met. So may a barrister. A tradesman may charge what he likes for goods, or an architect for plans; subject to this, that if no price or sum is agreed upon and the claimant has to sue, a jury may give him what is "reasonable." What is reasonable, however, is not any fixed sum. A butcher in Belgravia can recover more for meat than one in Whitechapel. An architect, high in his profession, will get more than a mere tyro; and the reasonableness of a general medical practitioner's account will be judged, partly by the custom of the locality where he practises, partly by the position in life of his patient. I know an instance where the account of a London medical man extended over a number of years, commencing when the medical man was a young man, and the patient in poor circumstances, and continuing through intermediate stages till the medical man was in a high professional position, and the patient in affluence. The charges were, on litigation ensuing, allowed on a basis varying from 2s. 6d. a visit at first to £2 2s. a visit at last. Something similar happens in all professions, and why should it be different in ours? At least the client may be supposed to know the value which his solicitor's services are likely to be to him in any matter, and in the absence of downright fraud it is impossible to say why a person and his attorney may not agree upon a stipulated amount beforehand.

It may be said, "So they can, under the Attorneys and Solicitors Act, 1870." This is a mistake. They may enter into an agreement for a fixed sum, it is true, but if the client chooses, he may have the agreement taxed, whilst in that event the solicitor is precluded, in any event, from recovering more than the stipulated sum. The result is that a solicitor dare not enter into such an agreement. He would be only too glad to do so, even if the agreement could be taxed, so long as it was taxed beforehand; for he would then be saved from what is a very laborious and expensive (far more so than is generally imagined) task—keeping up his entries; but at

present, knowing as he does the peculiarities of taxing masters, he knows also that the only effect of any such agreement will be that he cannot charge more than the sum stipulated, whilst, unless he keeps his entries and is prepared to show every item, he may get a good deal less than even his ordinary costs. Under a proper system there should be every inducement to a solicitor to do his work quickly and well; under your system there is every inducement to do exactly the opposite. The longer the business is kept about, and the more shilly shallying, running backwards and forwards, letter-writing and shedding of ink generally, the more costs.

Then, again, there is the uncertainty attending a taxation. I am not exaggerating when I say that I could name two taxing masters who vary as much as twenty per cent. in their allowances (not including disbursements). Can it be right that the mere accident of taxing a bill before one master instead of another should make so enormous a difference? A taxation by a client of a solicitor's bill is at present the most degrading, annoying, and worrying thing that can happen to a solicitor. Why? Because he knows that, however honest and fair his charges are, *something is sure to come off*. During many years' experience I never saw a bill taxed by a client when *something* was not taken off. It may have been only 4d. for a folio too much of some copy. But a small sum taken off in this way is no less a wound to a man's self-respect than a large one. It gives the client the right to say, "You overcharged me," when probably items of ten times the amount of the supposed overcharge were omitted accidentally, and never charged at all. Further, take this very case you commented on, of the difference of the masters as to allowing 1s. 4d. for a copy of a writ for service. Now, it is these miserable little items which give more trouble than any others. Any one who has done much agency business must have felt this particularly. Naturally, if a charge is allowed by one master, the solicitor will charge it to his country client. One such charge does not amount to much, but when you come to do a large agency business such charges amount to a good deal. Well, the bill is sent in every long vacation to the country client, and perhaps, after years have elapsed, his bill is taxed. These items are taken off, and it is well if you do not lose a good client in consequence. The least you can do is to have a grand comparing of items, and so forth, at an expense of much waste of time and annoyance, and all this over a lot of items which would have been allowed if the bill had got before any other taxing master. This is only one instance of the evil. Another is that a client is entitled to assume that his solicitor has tried to "do" him by charging items that would have been allowed if only the right taxing master had sat upon the bill.

Now, I am afraid you do not know enough to realize the advantages of leaving solicitors' charges open and free like other people's, nor to see that the present system of taxation degrades the profession, and is, in fact, the dunghill from whence spring the "shysters" of whom you have so many; the men to whom making up the bill of costs is the first consideration, the doing of the work well is the second. But you might improve matters. If you will not do away with the system of "costs" altogether, you might make it lawful for an attorney to make a bargain with his client, taxable *beforehand*; and you might carry out the principle adopted under the Common Law Procedure Act of making a fixed lump charge for each particular step in an action, as £4 and £3 8s. used to be charged for a writ. You might do away with the present ridiculous system of charging for each attendance and letter, for instructions and copying, and allow fees fixed in amount, in addition to actual stationer's charges for copies. You would be astonished to find how the bulk of papers would shrink under such a system, and how, if properly drawn up, such a plan would do away with numberless interlocutory applications. The first aim

should be the good of the public, getting their work well and quickly done, for, if they wish it (and I never saw one of them who did not), fees fixed *beforehand*; the second, the ennoblement of the profession, by freeing them from shackles which only degrade.

There may be opposition from vested interests, but, if the public insist upon it, such opposition must fail. Mr. Norwood seems inclined to look at these things like a reasonable man. Let him see if he cannot do something.

YOUR AMERICAN CORRESPONDENT.

San Francisco, California, Oct. 21.

## Cases of the Week.

**PARLIAMENTARY DEPOSIT—INSOLVENCY OF COMPANY—FORFEITURE TO THE CROWN.**—On the 14th inst., the Court of Appeal reversed the decision of Vice-Chancellor Malins in *Re The Bradford Tramways Company* (24 W. R. 815). The Act incorporating the company provided that a sum of £3,000, deposited in the Court of Chancery on the formation of the company, should be applied in compensating landowners whose property might be injured by the works, and for whom no other compensation was provided, and in making good any damage to the public roads, and, if no compensation should be payable, or the £3,000 should be more than sufficient to satisfy all just claims for compensation, then the £3,000, or the residue of it, should be forfeited to the Crown, "or, in the discretion of the court, if the company is insolvent and has been ordered to be wound up, or a receiver has been appointed, shall wholly or in part be paid to such receiver or to the liquidator or liquidators of the company, or be otherwise applied for the benefit of the creditors thereof." A very small portion of the required capital was subscribed, and the company consequently proved abortive. The works were never commenced, and no claims for compensation arose. An order was made to wind up the company, on the ground that it was unable to pay its debts. The liquidators presented a petition asking that the £3,000 might be paid over to them, on the ground that the company was insolvent, there not being enough assets to pay the debts without making calls on the shareholders. The Vice-Chancellor held that the liquidators were entitled to have the £3,000 applied in paying the debts before resorting to calls on the shareholders. The Court of Appeal (James, L.J., and Bagge and Bramwell, J.J.A.) held that the company was not to be considered insolvent until all that could be recovered by means of calls on the shareholders had been exhausted. If the sums so raised should be insufficient to pay the debts then the liquidators would be entitled to resort to the £3,000, but not before. The equity as against the right of the Crown was that of the creditors, not of the shareholders.

**SECURITY FOR COSTS OF APPEAL—SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES—ORD. 58, R. 15.**—In the case of *Brown v. Brown & Co.*, application was made to the Court of Appeal, on the 15th inst., that the defendant company should give security for the costs of an appeal which they had presented from a decree made by Vice-Chancellor Bacon. It appeared that a petition by a creditor to wind up the company was pending, and also that the company had passed a resolution to wind up voluntarily, which had not yet been confirmed. There was evidence on the part of the company that their assets were more than sufficient to pay their debts. The court (James, L.J., and Bramwell, J.J.A.) held that there was sufficient ground for requiring security to be given, and directed that £100 should be deposited in court. The costs of the application to be dealt with as costs of the appeal.

**NEW EVIDENCE ON APPEAL—APPEAL FROM LANCASTER CHANCERY COURT—JUDICATURE ACT, 1873, s. 18—ORD. 58, RR. 2, 5—WINDING UP—CONTRIBUTORY—SHARES ALLEGED TO BE NOT PAID UP—BURDEN OF PROOF.**—In a case of *Re The Commission Sale and Sample Room Company*, heard by the Court of Appeal on the 15th inst., the appeal was from an order of the Vice-Chancellor of the Lancaster Chancery Court, the effect of which was to decide

that certain shares, which were registered in the books of the company as fully paid up, were not in fact paid up, and to authorize the making of calls upon the shareholder. The order was in form an interlocutory one, though it operated in effect as a final decision between the parties. The counsel for the appellant expressed a wish to adduce fresh evidence. The court (James, L.J., and Bramwell, J.A.) thereupon expressed a strong opinion (though the point was not argued out) that, upon an appeal from the Lancaster court, the Court of Appeal was in the strictest sense a court of appeal, not a court of re-hearing, and that they could only exercise the same jurisdiction which was formerly vested in the old Court of Appeal in Chancery of the County Palatine (which consisted of the Chancellor of the Duchy and the Lords Justices, or any two of them), and that consequently fresh evidence could not be admitted. Another point decided in the case and worthy of being noted is this, that, when shares appear in the books of a company duly entered as paid up in full, if the liquidator alleges that they were not in fact paid up, the *onus* of proof lies upon him.

**BANKRUPTCY APPEAL—FRESH EVIDENCE—JUDICATURE ACT, 1875, s. 18; ORD. 58, r. 5—BANKRUPTCY RULES, 1870, r. 147.**—In a bankruptcy appeal, *In re Benson*, on the 16th inst., the Court of Appeal were asked to allow fresh evidence to be adduced. In the course of the argument Baggallay, J.A., suggested that, in order to admit fresh evidence on a bankruptcy appeal, it might not be necessary to show special circumstances under ord. 58, r. 5, inasmuch as by section 18 of the Act of 1875 it is provided that all rules of court in force at the time of the commencement of that Act in relation to appeals from the Chief Judge in Bankruptcy, "except so far as they are expressly varied by the first schedule hereto, or by rules of court made by Order in Council before the commencement of this Act, shall remain and be in force . . . in the Court of Appeal" until altered or annulled by any rules of court made after the commencement of the Act. The bankruptcy rule 147, of 1870, only says that "no new evidence shall be received on any appeal unless the Court of Appeal shall so direct." The point was not actually decided, for the court (James, L.J., and Baggallay and Bramwell, J.A.), without saying that any special circumstances had been proved, decided to admit the fresh evidence.

**SETTING DOWN BANKRUPTCY APPEAL—PRODUCTION OF ORDER APPEALED FROM.**—On the 16th inst., in several bankruptcy appeals the Court of Appeal complained that they had not been furnished with copies of the orders appealed from, and said that in future the officer of the court would be directed not to set down any appeal for hearing until the necessary copies of the orders appealed from had been furnished.

**FOLLOWING TRUST-MONEY—STOCKBROKER AND CLIENT.**—In *Re Strachan* an important question arose before the Court of Appeal on the 16th inst. with regard to the nature of the relation which exists between a stockbroker and his client. Is it a fiduciary relation, like that of a factor to his principal, or is it a mere relation of debtor and creditor, like that of a banker to his customer? The facts which gave rise to the question were briefly these:—A client, on the 11th of October, instructed his broker to sell for him £4,000 consols, and to invest the proceeds of sale in the purchase of railway stock. The consols belonged to the client as executor under a will, and he informed the broker of this fact. The consols were sold for cash the same day, but the railway stock was bought for the next settling day, which was the 13th of October. The broker received the purchase-money of the consols by means of a cheque drawn in his favour by the jobber to whom the sale was made. The broker, with the client's assent, retained the money for the purpose of paying for the railway stock, and he paid the cheque to the credit of his account current with his own bankers. On the 13th of October the broker was declared a defaulter on the Stock Exchange, and soon afterwards he filed a liquidation petition. The railway stock had not been paid for. The client thereupon claimed to have the balance which, at the time of

the broker's failure, was standing to his credit at his bankers' appropriated to make good the proceeds of the sale of the consols, and in support of this contention it was urged that, the money having been left with the broker to invest in a particular way, he was in truth a trustee of it for the client, and that, consequently, if it, or any part of it, could be ear-marked in the broker's possession, the client was entitled specifically to that which could be so traced. The case of *Taylor v. Plumer* (3 M. & S. 562) was relied on in support of this proposition. In that case a broker had been intrusted with a sum of money for the purpose of buying Exchequer bills for his client. He employed the money in buying some American bonds, and then attempted to abscond, taking the bonds with him. He was stopped before he had left the country, and the client succeeded in obtaining possession of the bonds. The broker was adjudicated a bankrupt, and his assignees sued the client to recover the bonds. It was held that the defendant was entitled to retain the bonds, because they had been purchased with his money. The Court of Appeal (James, L.J., and Baggallay and Bramwell, J.A.) held that this case was an authority which governed *Re Strachan*, and that the client in that case was entitled to be recouped out of the balance at the bankers' so far as it could be traced as derived from his money, according to the principle of *Pennell v. Deffell* (4 De G. M. & G. 379). James, L.J., and Baggallay, J.A., without actually going so far as to decide that as a general rule a stockbroker stands in a fiduciary relation to his client, held that, at any rate where the client is himself a trustee of the fund which he places in the broker's hands, and the broker has notice that the money is trust-money, it retains that character in his hands, and can be followed by the client if it can be traced. Bramwell, J.A., went farther, and expressed an opinion that this fiduciary relation exists wherever money is placed by a client in a stockbroker's hands for a specific purpose, observing that the *ratio decidendi* of *Taylor v. Plumer* went to this extent: that, if in that case the client's actual money had been found in the absconding broker's pocket, the client would have been entitled to have it, and it could make no difference that at the present day such transactions are settled by means of crossed cheques instead of by the handing over of coin.

**BILL OF SALE—REGISTRATION.**—The same day the Court of Appeal affirmed the decision of the Chief Judge in *Re Barrand* (L. R. 3 Ch. D. 324, noted 20 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 725). The facts were these:—A bill of sale of chattels was given to A. Afterwards a second bill of sale of the same chattels was given to B. The first bill of sale was not registered, the second was duly registered. The mortgagor became bankrupt. The holder of the first bill of sale was ousted by the trustee in the bankruptcy. But the Bills of Sale Act provides in effect that the omission to register a bill of sale shall render it void as against a trustee in bankruptcy or an execution creditor. The Act does not profess to make the unregistered bill of sale void as against any one else. The question raised was, who was entitled to the goods—the holder of the second bill of sale, or the trustee in the bankruptcy? On behalf of the trustee it was contended that the effect of the Act was to put him in the shoes of the first mortgagee, and that he was entitled to the goods to the extent to which the first mortgagee's charge was unsatisfied. The Chief Judge, however, upheld the claim of the second mortgagee, saying that when the first bill of sale was avoided by the Act it must be treated just as if it had been satisfied or had never existed, and then there was nothing to interfere with the title of the second mortgagee. James, L.J., took a very similar view of the case, observing that the court had nothing to do with any question between the first and second mortgagees, the only parties to the litigation being the trustee and the second mortgagee. The mortgagor, through whom the trustee derived his title, had assigned the goods absolutely to the second mortgagee, and there was nothing in the Act to take away his right. And Bramwell, J.A., said that the argument for the trustee amounted to this, "You, the second mortgagee, would have a perfectly good title against me but for the fact that some one else has no title as against me."



**SOLICITOR'S LIEN—CHANGE OF TRUSTEE IN BANKRUPTCY**—**BANKRUPTCY RULES, 1870, r. 249.**—The same day, in a case of *Re Austin*, a question arose as to a solicitor's right of lien where the trustee in a bankruptcy had been removed and a new one appointed in his stead. The old trustee was called upon to deliver up to the new one all the documents relating to his office. He alleged that he was unable to do this, because the documents were in the possession of his solicitor, who claimed a lien on them for his costs. Application was made to the court for an order on the old trustee and the solicitor to deliver up the documents. It was urged that the solicitor had ample security for the payment of such costs as he was entitled to charge against the estate in the fact that the estate was under the control of the court, which would take care that he was paid all that was justly due to him, and that, in regard to any costs which he could only charge against the old trustee personally, the lien would not avail him, inasmuch as the old trustee did not want the documents. It appeared, however, that the solicitor did not assert a lien upon any documents (such as deeds) which could be said to be the property of the estate, and which, therefore, on the appointment of the new trustee, had, by virtue of section 83, sub-section 6, vested in him, but claimed a lien only upon documents (such as papers relating to actions on behalf of the estate) which had been created by the solicitor's own labour. The Court of Appeal (James, L.J., and Baggallay and Bramwell, J.J.A.) held that the solicitor could not be deprived of this lien. They said that the application amounted to an attempt to effect a change of solicitors on terms other than the ordinary ones. The case was really governed by the authority of *Turner v. Lettis* (7 De G. M. & G. 243).

**CHARITABLE GIFT—WATER-WORKS DEBENTURES**—9 GEO. 2, c. 36, s. 3.—In the case of *Chandler v. Howell*, on the 11th inst., Vice-Chancellor Hall decided that debentures issued by the Improvement Commissioners of Aberystwith, charging "works, rents, and rates authorized to be erected, reserved, made, and collected" by a private Act authorizing the purchase of land and construction of gas works and water works, were within section 3 of the Statute of Charitable Uses, and could not, therefore, be bequeathed to a charity. The debenture in this case differed from that in *Holdsworth v. Davenport* (25 W. R. 20, L. R. 3 Ch. D. 185) (cited by *Dickinson, Q.C.*, who, with *T. A. Roberts*, appeared for the plaintiffs) only in the substitution of "works, rents, and rates" for "undertaking, tolls, and sums of money" in the parcels. *O. Morgan, Q.C.*, and *Elphinstone*, appeared for the defendants, and *Kekewich* for a charity interested under the will.

**COUNTER-CLAIM BY DEFENDANT AGAINST PLAINTIFF AND CO-DEFENDANTS—JUDICATURE ACT, 1873, s. 24, SUB-SECTION 3.—ORD. 22, r. 9.**—In *Young v. Brassey*, before Vice-Chancellor Hall on the 9th inst. a question arose upon a counter-claim between co-defendants. The transactions stated were somewhat complicated, but the following are the material facts:—In June, 1870, the defendants *Brassey & Co.* purchased some land at Marseilles from a Frenchman for the purposes of a railway of which they had secured a concession. The vendor, during the negotiations, wrote a letter to a Mr. Dobson promising to pay him a sum of £6,000 by way of commission for his services in bringing about the transaction, and a few days afterwards another letter promising to pay him a further commission of £6,000, "on account of Mr. Bowles," in consideration of the said Mr. Bowles signing a contract relating to the concession between himself and *Brassey & Co.* In the event of the purchase being completed *Brassey & Co.* were authorized to pay these two commissions to Dobson out of their purchase-money. The plaintiffs alleged that Dobson, having misapplied moneys in his hands belonging to them, had assigned his interest under both the above letters to them, to make good his defalcations. The defendants *Brandons* alleged that they were prior mortgagees of Dobson's interest under both letters; and the plaintiffs and the defendants *Brandons* agreed that *Bowles* had no beneficial interest in either of the said sums. The defendant *Harrison* delivered a defence and counter-claim (making the plaintiffs and all the other defendants defendants to the counter-claim), whereby he alleged that *Bowles* was beneficially entitled to the commission of £6,000,

and also to £1,000, part of the £8,000, and submitted that the claims of all parties ought to be adjudicated upon by a French court, but in case the English court had jurisdiction he claimed a declaration that he was entitled, as mortgagee of *Bowles'* interest, to the said sums of £6,000 and £1,000, and also claimed priority to the plaintiffs and other defendants so far as such sums were concerned. *Dickinson, Q.C.*, and *Grosvenor Woods*, for the defendants *Brandons*, now moved, under ord. 22, r. 9, that the counter-claim might be excluded, or amended by striking out the parts irrelevant to *Harrison's* defence. They cited *Pudwick v. Scott* (L. R. 2 Ch. D. 744), and relied on the observations of *Mellish, L.J.*, in *Trelaven v. Brey* (24 W. R. 198, 20 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 112), as to the intention of section 24, sub-section 3, of the Act of 1873, and urged that the plaintiffs ought not to be kept waiting while two defendants were litigating another issue. The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be a very strong course to strike out a counter-claim against the plaintiff and defendants jointly on the application of a defendant without hearing the plaintiff, who might possibly consider it a convenient mode of settling the question. *Dickinson, Q.C.*, and *Grosvenor Woods*, then asked that the counter-claim might be amended by striking out such portions of it as sought relief against the defendants *Brandons*. They urged that the issues between *Harrison* and the defendants would only arise in the improbable event of the plaintiffs' case failing, and that they had nothing to do with the action, but ought to be disposed of in a separate action. If it were found that *Bowles* had no interest, the whole litigation would be thrown away. The Vice-Chancellor said that the whole case must be taken into consideration. *Harrison's* contention was that he was entitled to *Bowles's* interest, and that even if the plaintiffs or defendants *Brandons* succeeded in establishing any claim against that interest he had priority over them. Practically it amounted to an interpleader issue, and the section must not be narrowed down so as to exclude a form of pleading which would ascertain the rights of the parties once for all. The motion must be refused, with costs.

**DISPUTED INTEREST IN PROBATE ACTIONS.**—In the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division, on Tuesday, November 14, *H. B. Deane* moved the court, in a case of *Metcalf v. James*, to strike out the statement of defence and to order proof of the will in solemn form, on the ground that it set up no interest in the defendant, raising only the issues that the will was not duly executed, that the testator was not of sound mind, and that the alleged execution was obtained by fraud. He contended that the interest of the defendant must be set up in his statement. *Searle*, for the defendant, relied upon the provision in ord. 9, r. 12, that "in probate actions, where the plaintiff disputes the interest of the defendant, he shall allege in his statement of claim that he denies the defendant's interest"; and he also pointed out that under the old practice the interest could not be disputed after declaration (r. 37). The president of the division said that the new rule only carried out the old system, and that its object was to bring all parties before the court and to have all questions determined at the least possible expense. The plaintiff ought to have included a denial of the defendant's interest in his statement of claim, and thus have given the latter notice that his interest was disputed and put him to proof of it. The motion must be refused with costs, but the plaintiff could move to amend his statement of claim by adding a denial of the defendant's interest.

**CITATION—SUBSTITUTED SERVICE IN ENGLAND.**—In the case of *Brown v. Brown and Day*, recently before the Probate and Divorce Division, *J. P. Middleton* moved for leave to serve the citation on the respondent by advertisement, or as the court should direct, although the respondent was living in England, and her place of residence was known to the petitioner. The affidavits set forth that the respondent was in the keeping of the co-respondent at his residence, that the co-respondent had threatened to shoot any one who should attempt to enter his house for the purpose of effecting personal service, and that the co-respondent had offered to allow the respondent to be served upon being indemnified from all costs in the suit and receiving a present of £5. Upon hearing these facts the court made an order for service of the citation at the co-respondent's place of residence, thereby dispensing with personal service.

**PROOF IN BANKRUPTCY—LIQUIDATED DAMAGES—PENALTY.**—In a case of *Re Newman*, heard by the Chief Judge on the 13th inst., some builders had entered into a contract to erect a school-house, which it was stipulated was to be completed and delivered up to the governors on or before the 25th of December, 1875. The contract provided that the sum to be paid as the price of the building should be paid by instalments in the ordinary way, and there was a stipulation that, if the works were not completed by the appointed day, the builders should forfeit to the governors £10 per week for each week during which the works should remain unfinished. There was also a provision that in case the contract should not be in all things duly performed by the builders they should pay to the governors £1,000 as and for liquidated damages. In November, 1875, the builders filed a liquidation petition. The trustee appointed under this petition carried on the works for a time, but in January, 1876, gave notice to abandon the contract. The governors employed other builders to finish the works, but they were not completed till September, 1876. The governors claimed to prove in the liquidation for £1,000 damages, but did not show by evidence that they had sustained any particular damage. The judge of the county court was of opinion that the £1,000 was named in the agreement as a penalty, and that the governors could not prove without showing actual damage. The Chief Judge held that the contract must be construed strictly according to its terms, and that the governors had a right to prove for the £1,000, without adducing any evidence of actual damage.

**ASSIGNMENT OF TRUST FUND—NOTICE—PRIORITY.**—In another case of *Re Lower*, heard the same day, the receivers appointed in a chancery suit for the dissolution of a partnership between Reed & Lower had been directed by the decree, after paying the debts and costs, to pay the residue of the moneys received by them to the two partners according to their respective interests in the partnership. On the 6th of September, Lower gave to Wilkes, one of the receivers, a charge on his interest in the moneys to secure a debt due from him to Wilkes. On the 18th of September Lower signed an order on Wilkes authorizing him to pay to Garrard & Bartram (to whom Lower was largely indebted) the balance due to him from the partnership estate. The same day Wilkes signed a written acceptance of this order, in which he stated that he estimated the balance coming to Lower at about £500, but he did not inform Garrard & Bartram of his own prior charge. In December, Wilkes, with the assent of the other receiver, appropriated £400, part of the moneys received on account of the estate, in part payment of his own charge. Lower afterwards became bankrupt. The county court judge decided that Wilkes was bound to inform Garrard & Bartram, when he accepted the order to pay them, of his own prior charge, and that by his omission to do this he had lost his priority, and his honour ordered Wilkes to pay the £400 which he had retained to Garrard & Bartram. The Chief Judge held that no such obligation could be imposed upon Wilkes, and that nothing had taken place to deprive him of his priority.

**APPEAL FROM COUNTY COURT—ENTERING EVIDENCE IN ORDER—JUDGE'S NOTES.**—In a third case of *Re Dowling*, the same day, an appeal from a county court had been in the paper for hearing before the long vacation. On that occasion it appeared that the evidence upon which the order was based had not been entered in it, and the Chief Judge then remitted the case to the county court to have the evidence duly entered. When the appeal was restored to the paper, and had been again opened, it appeared that there was entered in the order that which purported to be the effect of the evidence of a witness who had been examined *videlicet* in court, and it was stated by counsel in explanation of this that no record existed of this witness's evidence, unless it was to be found in notes taken by the judge himself. The Chief Judge said that he could not act upon what only purported to be the effect of the evidence; he must have the witness's own words, so that he might be able to form his own judgment as to their meaning. He must therefore see the judge's notes, or the witness must be re-examined. It was arranged that the latter course should be adopted.

### UNIVERSITY EDUCATION FOR SOLICITORS.\*

At the last provincial meeting of this society an excellent paper was read by our friend Mr. Shirley, of Doncaster, on "The Practical Training of Solicitors." I have no intention to call into question the views expressed in that paper, or the course of study which the writer has recommended to the generality of young men, on their leaving school at the ordinary age, for the acquirement of the practical knowledge of our profession. Mr. Shirley expressly stated that his remarks were intended "to apply to a training for a special practice, in which bread had to be earned and the butcher's bill paid, and not to the study of the law as a general science." In the majority of cases of young men destined for a solicitor's profession, it will probably be an object of importance to parents, with respect to family considerations and other circumstances, to confine the expense and period of education within the narrowest possible limits, and I cannot therefore expect a general application for the remarks which I am about to offer.

The circumstance of the selection of Oxford as the place of the provincial meeting for this year will, I hope, be regarded as a sufficient excuse for a member of your body and of the university to offer a brief exposition of some of the advantages which appear to him to be available to members of our profession from a university career.

In considering this subject, it must be borne in mind that the standard of education has been much raised within recent years, and, as members of a learned and responsible profession, parents must take care that their sons do not fall behind in the race for intellectual advancement.

"Tis education forms the common mind;  
Just as the twig is bent the tree's inclined."

The importance to members of our profession of what is commonly called "higher education," and of a knowledge of the principles of law, is, I think, generally admitted. The practical question is, What is the best period for and the best mode of attaining these objects?

If a boy leaves school at the age of sixteen or seventeen, and becomes at once articled to a solicitor, the most fitting opportunity for the acquisition of general knowledge, and especially for maturing the knowledge—be it either classical, mathematical, or scientific—which he has acquired at school, is lost, and the mind is likely to become too soon cramped by the exclusive study of law in connection with its practical office work. It is the remembrance of the drudgery of rudimentary work at school which often makes the pursuit of studies, originated there, distasteful in after-life to the young man who leaves school at an early age, and they consequently become neglected; but when, by further instruction and attention, advance has been made in those studies, they generally become appreciated, and their advantages are thus secured.

It would be beyond the limits of this paper to discuss the comparative merits of a literary and a scientific education as a general preparation for our profession; I must, however, confess my own preference for a literary education. It is that which has been recommended as the one which introduces man to man, which makes him a partaker of the thoughts of all his kind, and which puts him on a level (so far at least as to be able to understand what they have thought and left behind them) with all the greatest and most cultivated minds that have ever been.

The works of the great classical authors are admitted to be the well-springs of genius, science, and taste, and I cannot conceive a better mental discipline for the future lawyer than a careful study of the works of Plato and Thucydides, of Cicero and Tacitus; and an acquaintance, with the poetry of Sophocles and Euripides, of Horace and Virgil, will prove, not only an accomplishment, but afford him much intellectual gratification in after-life. Cicero has constantly in his writings recommended the study of the works of his predecessors in Greek and Roman literature, and referred to the profit and pleasure to be derived from a knowledge of them.

\* A paper read at the annual provincial meeting of the Incorporated Law Society at Oxford in October, 1876, by C. W. Lawrence, M.A., solicitor.

"Hæc studia adolescentiam alunt, senectutem oblectant, secundas res ornant, adversis perfugium et solatium præbent; delectant domi, non impediunt foris, pernecant nobiscum, peregrinantur, rusticantur" (Oratio pro Archia poeta).

The universities provide, not only excellent education during the critical period of life between youth and manhood, but there is a society to be found there in which young men can associate with others of kindred taste and character, and are thus enabled to form friendships and connections which may prove of the greatest benefit in a future professional career.

Furthermore, at the university, a man has the opportunity of acquiring self-knowledge and habits of intellectual exertion, which is lost to one who goes into the world at a school-boy period of life.

I am not sufficiently acquainted with the course of study at the other universities to allude specifically to them, but I believe that Cambridge, at all events, has within recent years extended the subjects of her examinations. My remarks must principally apply to Oxford.

Some years ago the education at Oxford was confined within the limits of divinity, philosophy, classics, and mathematics, and no great amount of study was then required for passing the two examinations which were necessary for the attainment of the B.A. degree. During that period the university was principally resorted to by members of the aristocracy and of wealthy families, who went there as much for social as for educational purposes, and by young men destined for the Church (for which a B.A. degree was then a necessary passport), for the bar, and the highest stages of the medical profession.

So little was intellectual work appreciated here about thirty years ago that I can in my own time recall the definition of Oxford by a "logic coach" as "a place where there are nineteen colleges and five halls, commonly called a seat of learning, but more properly a hunting-box." Within the last thirty years great changes have been effected. The number of the examinations has been increased and the attendance at lectures more strictly enforced. The university has now fully recognized its position and obligations as one of the principal seats of higher education in this country for all professions. Here are professors and lecturers in nearly every science, and instead of the set discourses of former times, the teaching is closely adapted to the wants of individual students. It is the breadth and universality of this education that makes it so superior to any which can be afforded by any merely technical school.

Apart from these general considerations, special advantages are now afforded by the university for the furtherance of legal studies. The degree of Bachelor of Arts can be taken in the twelfth term, or within a period of three years of residence at the university. The first examination, called responsions, which only requires such a moderate knowledge of classics and mathematics as is possessed by any boy who has held a fair position at school, can be passed at the end of the first term. The second examination, or moderations, can be passed at the end of the first year of residence, and requires from ordinary passmen but little further knowledge of classics and mathematics than had to be displayed in the first examination. Upon the passing of the second examination, a student desirous of devoting the remainder of his time at Oxford to the prosecution of legal studies, can give up any further classical or mathematical work and qualify himself for a B.A. degree, by taking honours in the School of Jurisprudence, and passing an examination either in the rudiments of faith and religion, or, if that subject be objected to on conscientious grounds, in some books appointed for the purpose by the Board of Studies from among the groups of subjects proposed for candidates who do not seek honours at the second public examination.

According to regulations lately issued by the examiners in the School of Jurisprudence, the following are the present subjects of examination in that school:—

1. General jurisprudence, involving a sufficient knowledge of its principles, the theory of legislation, and the early history of legal institutions.

2. History of English law, involving a sufficient knowledge of the principles of the constitutional law, and of the law of real property.

3. Roman law, involving an acquaintance with the Institutes of Gaius and the Emperor Justinian.

4. English law, represented by a knowledge of the principles of the law of contract.

And for aspirants to the highest honours—

5. International law, involving a knowledge of its outlines as a system, and also the history of the laws extending to seas, ships, and navigable rivers in time of peace.

The works of Austin, Bentham, Maine, Blackstone, Hallam, Stubbs, Digby, Joshua Williams, and Pollock are the textbooks for students in this school.

This summary of the selection of subjects and authors is in itself a tribute to the system of legal education in the university. It is a selection which results from a matured experience in the science of education. It affords invaluable aid to the legal novice, who is eager to make progress, but is unable to deal with the mass of conflicting law which confronts him. It is the minimum that could explain with sufficient accuracy the leading principles which regulate actual practice, and yet it contains those principles in a form which is not too concise. The works of Austin and the treatise of Bentham on the "Theory of Legislation," give a sufficient insight into the purely analytical principles of jurisprudence and legislation; while Maine traces historically the varying applications of those principles, and points out their gradual development. The study of Gaius and Justinian teaches in outline the greatest legal system that has ever existed, and further explains the many details in which English law has been indebted to its influence. Blackstone, Hallam, and Stubbs represent the various views of those thoughtful writers on the progress of our constitutional and judicial system, which has attained a success beyond that of any other modern country. The works of Williams and Pollock are more distinctly practical; but no time is lost by the student who acquires a certain knowledge of the elements of the law of real property and of contracts, before attempting actual office work. International law is daily giving rise to important questions, and although it is not a necessary portion of the university system, it cannot be well omitted by any one who takes an interest in matters which influence the life and history of our time.

There are eminent university professors who deliver lectures on these subjects during term time; and besides these professors, there are several lecturers on law in different colleges. Moreover, great facilities are afforded to students in the shape of ready access to the well-supplied law library at All Souls' College.

The study of law at Oxford has thus now been carefully provided for, not in the shape of practical training, which must take place in a barrister's chambers or a solicitor's office, but by affording the means of acquiring a knowledge of its broad principles in obedience to old Coke's maxim: "Melius est petere fontes quam sectari rivulos."

The law schools at Oxford may not go far into the knowledge of law, but they go quite far enough to enable persons who resort to them for honours to appreciate the meaning of reading law, and to guide them in doing so. The advantages of this guidance have been frequently mentioned to me by young men on their commencing work in chambers, and they have freely admitted the benefits which they have derived in other respects from university training.

It is well known that matriculation at the university dispenses with the preliminary examination which would otherwise be required of a young man before he is articulated, and that the attainment of a B.A. degree dispenses with two years of service under articles.

As the B.A. degree can now be obtained within three years, the loss of the single year is amply compensated for by the educational and social advantages to be derived from a university career.

The university authorities may not be indisposed at a future day to reduce the period of three years by making arrangements for the prosecution of study in a portion of the long vacation. If this could be accomplished, they would be conferring a further boon on our profession.

In order to make Oxford as accessible as possible to all classes of students, statutes have been lately passed enabling a person to become a member of the university without necessarily becoming a member of a college or hall, provided that he satisfies some disciplinary requirements. Such students are free, within certain limits, to choose their own lodging, and to fix their own rate of living. No public provision is made for their instruction other than that which is open to all members of the university, without distinction;



but in matters of discipline they are under the control of a special Board. The social advantages of a collegiate life, and the gratification of a college connection in after-years, are, however, lost to these unattached students; and I consider that the old system of residence within the college walls is far preferable, and should be resorted to when circumstances will permit, the principal objection to it with respect to expense having been modified within recent years.

It has been lately officially stated that, so far as university and college fees and the expense of board and lodging are concerned, a student residing within a college or hall can, with economy, obtain the degree of B.A. for a total expenditure of £300. That estimate includes board, room rent or lodging, and washing, for twelve terms of residence, tuition, and miscellaneous college charges, admission, examination, and degree fees; the necessary expenses (which it does not include) are clothes, books, travelling expenses, and the cost of living in the vacations, and these are of course within individual control.

Furthermore, there are the rewards of scholarships and fellowships available by intelligent and industrious students. In the particular department of law there are the Eldon and the Vinerian scholarships awarded by the university, the former, once in every three years, to the most deserving candidate who has passed with distinction all the examinations necessary for the B.A. degree; and the latter, three in number, for which one scholar is elected every Hilary term; the emoluments being £80 per annum for three years, the candidates to have completed, but not to have exceeded, six years from their matriculation. The fellowships of All Souls' College have been especially destined for men who have passed a successful examination in subjects recognized in the Schools of Jurisprudence and Modern History.

In conclusion, as there seems to be but little chance of our obtaining, in a teaching capacity at all events, the General School of Law for which such efforts have been made by Lord Selborne and other champions of legal education, it is well for us to fall back on the universities, which have now thoroughly identified themselves with national feelings and tastes, and have, as regards Oxford at all events, especially recognized the claim of law as a science to be taught by them, and so secure to future members of our profession (which is admitted to be a high and honourable one) a knowledge of legal principles, as well as of legal practice; and furthermore that *status* which society accords to those who have had a liberal education, confirmed by a university degree.

## Societies.

### LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

At the meeting of this society, held at the Law Institution on Tuesday last, the question for discussion was as follows:—"Are goods delivered to one exercising a public trade to be dealt with in the way of his business privileged from distress if the trader is not in occupation, for the purpose of his trade, of the premises on which the goods are?" *Lyons v. Elliott* (24 W. R. 296); and see article in SOLICITORS' JOURNAL for the 12th of February, 1876." Mr. Eady opened the debate in the affirmative, and was followed by Mr. Stock in the negative. After an interesting discussion, the question was ultimately decided in the affirmative by a majority of one vote.

### UNITED LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

A meeting of this society took place at Clement's-inn Hall on Wednesday evening, November 15, Mr. J. S. Rubinstein in the chair. Mr. N. M. Roche opened the question for debate, viz.—"That the present system of election of members of Parliament does not secure a true representation of the opinions of the electors, and is, therefore, unsatisfactory." A very animated debate ensued, and in the end a large majority were in favour of the motion. Thirty-five members were present.

Mr. William Watson, LL.D., Lord Advocate of Scotland, has been elected M.P. for the Universities of Glasgow and Aberdeen in the Conservative interest, in succession to Lord Gordon.

## Obituary.

### MR. GEORGE NELSON.

Mr. George Nelson, solicitor, of Buckingham, died at his residence, Tingewick, Bucks, on the 6th inst., after a very short illness. Mr. Nelson was admitted a solicitor in 1834, and had ever since practised at Buckingham. He was originally associated in business with the late Mr. Thomas Hearn, the firm having been afterwards joined by Mr. Henry Hearn, the present registrar of the Buckingham County Court. Mr. Nelson had been clerk of the peace for the borough of Buckingham since 1840, and town clerk since 1848. He was also vestry clerk, clerk to the Buckingham Burial Board and to the Trustees of the Bucks and Hanwell Turnpike Roads, a commissioner for oaths in the High Court, and a perpetual commissioner for Buckinghamshire. He was also a commissioner of taxes for the borough, and a member of the Buckingham and Tingewick School Boards. His politics were Liberal, and he advocated an unsectarian policy in educational affairs. Mr. Nelson lost his wife about a fortnight before his death, and the loss appears to have had a deep effect upon him. The town council, at the annual meeting on the 9th inst., passed a vote expressive of their regret at his death. Mr. Nelson was buried at Sherington on the 13th inst., and the Mayor and corporation of Buckingham attended the funeral.

### MR. WILLIAM SPARLING.

Mr. William Sparling, one of the oldest solicitors in London, died at his residence, 6, Wartersville-road, Hornsey-rise, on the 6th inst., in his ninety-first year. Mr. Sparling was the son of the late Mr. William Sparling, solicitor, of Colchester, and was born in 1786. He was admitted a solicitor in 1814, and for a short time practised at 11, Castle-court, Budge-row, in partnership with Mr. Thomas Wood and Mr. Henry Clark. He then returned to Colchester, where he was associated, first with the late Mr. Samuel Wittey, and afterwards with Mr. Sayers Turner and Mr. Henry Griffith Deane. He held for several years the office of town clerk of Colchester (now held by Mr. S. Turner), but afterwards resumed his London business, which he carried on successively at 22, Lincoln's-inn-fields, 1, King's-road, and 164, City-road. His son, Mr. John Alexander Sparling (admitted in 1843), was for many years in partnership with him. Mr. Sparling was elected in 1852 as clerk and solicitor to the trustees of Islington parish, and in 1857, on the division of the offices (consequent upon the passing of the Metropolitan Local Government Act of 1855), he became solicitor only. The trustees were superseded by the Metropolitan Poor Law Act of 1867, and he was then appointed solicitor to the Islington Board of Guardians at a salary of £100 a year. The Poor Law Board refused to sanction the nomination, and he afterwards, by a *mandamus*, established his claim to compensation in the shape of an annuity (*Reg. v. The Local Government Board*, 22 W. R. 315, L. R. 9 Q. B. 148). Mr. Sparling retained all his mental and bodily faculties till a very short time before his death.

At a pension of the Hon. Society of Gray's-inn held on the 8th inst., Master Henuiker, Q.C., was nominated a member of the Council of Legal Education, in the place of Mr. Justice Manisty.

The judge of the Liverpool County Court is stated to have decided that a railway company was obliged to furnish a first-class carriage free from tobacco smoke if a traveller so desired.

At the opening of the Berwick County Court says the *Glasgow News*, the judge complained bitterly of the discourtesy of the municipal authorities of Berwick in general, and of the mayor in particular. He had made a proposition to hold his court on Thursdays for the purpose of saving time and expense, but, as Thursday is the magistrates' court day, the mayor refused to accede to the county court judge's request. The judge is stated to have informed the court that as mayors, especially perverse mayors, did not live for ever, he had hope yet that his request would be granted on the "arising of a new king."

## Appointments, &c.

Mr. PHILIP JOHN WILLIAM COOKE, solicitor, of Gloucester, has been elected Clerk to the new Gloucester School Board. Mr. Cooke was admitted a solicitor in 1850, and is also clerk to the Gloucester Branch of the Bristol Channel Pilotage Board, and secretary to the Incorporated Gloucester Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. GEORGE FIELDING, solicitor and notary, has been elected Mayor of the Borough of Dover for the ensuing year. Mr. Fielding was admitted a solicitor in 1849, and is one of the aldermen of Dover. He is also district registrar of the High Court of Justice, registrar of the Dover County Court, clerk to the St. Mary's Burial Board, and secretary to the Dover Gas Light Company.

Mr. FRANCIS GOSTLING FOSTER, solicitor (of the firm of Fosters, Burroughes, & Robberds), of Norwich, has been appointed Under-Sheriff for the City and County of the City of Norwich for the ensuing year. Mr. Foster is a son of the late Sir William Foster, Bart., and was admitted a solicitor in 1852.

Mr. HENRY JAMES FRANKLIN, solicitor, of Halifax, has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner for taking the Acknowledgments of Deeds by Married Women for the West Riding of Yorkshire.

Mr. WILLIAM HENRY GILL, solicitor, of Wakefield, has been re-elected Mayor of that Borough for the ensuing year. Mr. Gill was admitted a solicitor in 1859.

Mr. JOHN POPE HENNESSY, barrister, C.M.G., has been appointed Governor of the Colony of Hong-Kong. Mr. Hennessy is the son of Mr. John Hennessy, of Ballyhennessy, and was born in 1834. He was educated at the Queen's University, Ireland, and was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Michaelmas Term, 1861, and was formerly a member of the Home Circuit. He was M.P. for King's County in the Conservative interest from 1859 till 1865. Mr. Hennessy was appointed Governor of Labuan in 1867, Governor of the Bahamas in 1871, Administrator-in-Chief of the West African Settlements in 1872, and Governor of the Windward Islands in 1875. He was created a Companion of the Order of St. Michael and St. George in 1872.

Mr. SAMUEL HOBBS, jun., solicitor, of Wells, has been elected Mayor of that City for the ensuing year. Mr. Hobbs was admitted a solicitor in 1850.

Mr. ROBERT HOLBY, solicitor, of York, has been appointed Under-Sheriff of the City and County of the City of York for the ensuing year.

Mr. JOHN WATLING ION, solicitor, has been elected Mayor of the Borough of Bury St. Edmunds for the third time. Mr. Ion was admitted a solicitor in 1838, and is deputy-coroner for the Liberty of Bury St. Edmunds, clerk to the Bury Burial Board, and vestry clerk of St. Mary's and St. James' parishes (forming the town).

Mr. CHARLES LAMB, solicitor, of Brighton, has been elected Mayor of the Borough of Brighton for the ensuing year. Mr. Lamb was admitted a solicitor in 1840, and is one of the aldermen of the borough. He is the first solicitor who has attained the office of Mayor of Brighton since its incorporation.

Mr. HENRY LOCK, solicitor, has been elected Mayor of Dorchester for the ensuing year. Mr. Lock was admitted in 1835, and is in partnership with his son, Mr. Arthur Henry Lock. He is an alderman of the borough, deputy-coroner for the county, clerk to the burial board and board of guardians, and superintendent-registrar. Mr. Lock served the same office in the year 1858.

Mr. SAMUEL MAPLES, of Nottingham, has been appointed Under-Sheriff, and Mr. JAMES WELLS TAYLOR, of 28, Great James-street, London, Deputy-Sheriff, of the Town and County of the Town of Nottingham.

Mr. WALTER MAYHEW, solicitor, of Wigan, has been elected Mayor of that Borough for the ensuing year. Mr. Mayhew was admitted a solicitor in 1860, and is in partnership with Mr. Frank Adcock. He is one of the aldermen of the borough, and clerk to the Ashton Highway Board.

Mr. CECIL MOORE, solicitor, of Dublin and Omagh, has been appointed Clerk of the Rules in the Court of Common Pleas in Ireland, in the place of Mr. Arthur Greene, deceased. Mr. Moore was admitted a solicitor at Dublin in 1847, and has been for some time Crown Solicitor for the County of Armagh.

Mr. GEORGE NICOL, solicitor (of the firm of Nicol, Son, & Jones), 48, Lime-street, London, has been appointed a Commissioner for taking Affidavits in the Supreme Court of Judicature for the Colony of Victoria, South Australia.

Mr. GODFREY RICHARD PARK, solicitor, of Hedon, and of Hull, has been re-elected Mayor of the Borough of Hedon for the ensuing year. Mr. Park was admitted a solicitor in 1841, and is clerk to the county magistrates for the Holderness division, and holds several public appointments.

Mr. ANDREW PERCIVAL, solicitor, of Peterborough, has been elected Mayor of that City for the ensuing year. Mr. Percival was admitted a solicitor in 1839, and was for many years coroner for the city and liberty of Peterborough, but resigned those offices last year. He was formerly in partnership with Mr. Henry Pearson Gates, the retiring mayor, but is now associated with his son, Mr. John Andrew Percival.

Mr. MARWOOD TUCKER, barrister, has been appointed an Additional Private Secretary to the Special Embassy of the Marquis of Salisbury to Constantinople. Mr. Tucker was educated at Exeter College, Oxford, and was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Hilary Term, 1863. He formerly practised as an equity draughtsman and conveyancer.

Mr. WILLIAM EDWARD TALLENTS, solicitor (of the firm of Tallents & Co.), of Newark, has been elected Mayor of that borough for the ensuing year. Mr. Tallents was admitted a solicitor in 1864, and is Under-Sheriff of Lincolnshire for the ensuing year.

Mr. DOWNES WIGGLESWORTH, barrister, has been elected Mayor of the Borough of Queensborough for the ensuing year. Mr. Wigglesworth was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Michaelmas Term, 1852.

## Legal News.

Mr. De Moleyns, Q.C., has been appointed to hold the inquiry, ordered by the House of Commons last session, into the case of Mr. Croker, who complained of being unjustly dismissed from the Irish Constabulary, in which he had been an officer for over thirty years.

The Supreme Court, in the first department, says the *Albany Law Journal*, have inaugurated a practice which, if it should be generally adopted, will become a means of inducing students of law to thoroughly prepare themselves for their examination for admission. One of the applicants for admission to the bar, at the late general term, passed so creditable an examination as to call forth a very favourable comment from the examining committee. The presiding judge thereupon himself administered the attorney's oath to this candidate, leaving the remainder admitted to be sworn in by the clerk.

In the case of *Continental Ins. Co. of Hartford*, plaintiff in error, v. *Delpinch*, executor of Smith, says the *Albany Law Journal*, a person whose life was insured in the company mentioned by a policy conditioned against suicide, was found drowned, not far from a ford. It was claimed by the plaintiff below that deceased had attempted to cross this ford in a dark and foggy night, and, missing his way, lost his life. Owing to the position in which the body was found, the company claimed that the deceased had probably come to his death through suicide, and gave as part of the proof of that fact that he was a believer in spiritualism. The court said that they were unable to see that his belief in spiritualism, or the fact that he believed he would enjoy all the pleasures of this life after death, was evidence of suicide. "To conclude otherwise, is to assume that the expectation of greater enjoyments in a future life than in this, creates a suicidal desire. If this reasoning be correct, it would follow that a devout Christian, who believes in a blessed

immortality, is more likely to commit suicide than one who believes in no God, and in no resurrection. The desire of self-preservation is firmly imbedded in human nature. A legal conclusion of suicide ought not to be drawn from the mere fact of a belief in spiritualism."

On Wednesday last, before the Master of the Rolls, the Times reporter says, Mr. Romer applied, on behalf of all parties to the now historical action of *Case v. Mackenzie*, for directions as to the trial thereof, which, he submitted, ought to be by jury, provided this branch of the court could have a trial before it with a jury. The case, it may be remembered, is the one in which the defendant gave notice requiring a trial by jury; and his lordship directed issues to be tried by Mr. Baron Huddleston, at the last Hertfordshire Assizes, which were not tried for want of time, or some other reason. The Master of the Rolls said it was a singular thing that, since the coming into operation of the Judicature Acts, he had directed issues in three cases only, and in each of those cases, from causes over which he had no control, the order had proved abortive. According to his recollection of the present case, it was one which ought not to be tried without a jury, the question being simply whether somebody bought property on his own account or as agent for another person. If the parties really wished for a trial by jury he would do his best to gratify them by directing fresh issues, but he was determined not to try any case with a jury unless and until the Court of Appeal should decide that he had power so to try a case.

At the Liverpool County Court, on Tuesday last, says the *Liverpool Daily Post*, before Mr. T. P. E. Thompson, judge, and a jury, a case involving a somewhat novel point was tried. The plaintiffs were Misses Isabella and Emily Vaughan, and they sought to recover the sum of £22 15s. 3d. from the defendants, Messrs. Stephens & Danger, solicitors, Liverpool, for damages alleged to have been sustained through the professional negligence of Mr. Danger. Mr. Boulton (Boulton & Avison) appeared for the plaintiffs, and Mr. Walton, barrister, for the defendants. The plaintiffs, it appeared, kept a ladies' school at Camden-street, Birkenhead; and Mr. Joseph Parker, grocer's clerk and lodging-house keeper, became indebted to them for instruction to his children to the amount of £22 15s. 3d. Parker got into difficulties, and called a meeting of his creditors. Mr. Danger was instructed, on behalf of the plaintiffs, to represent their interests and to object to a composition. Mr. Danger attended the first meeting; but, for some reason, he was not present at the second, when a majority of the creditors accepted a composition. The contention of Mr. Boulton, for the plaintiffs, was that they had sustained a certain loss by the absence of Mr. Danger, because, if he had been present, the composition would probably not have been accepted. After the opening of the case, his Honour suggested an arrangement. It was clear the plaintiffs could only claim nominal damages, as no substantial damage could be proved. The parties to the case had a consultation, but no arrangement was come to. His Honour pointed out that there could be no ground of action against Mr. Stephens at all; and his name was withdrawn from the case. After hearing evidence, the jury found a verdict for the plaintiffs against Mr. Danger, damages 1s.

The Dublin correspondent of the *Times* refers to a difficulty which has caused disquietude to some of her Majesty's judges in Ireland. It has been a subject of comment in the press, and the discussion called forth the novel proceeding of an explanation from the bench. It relates to the appointment of registrar to the Court of Common Pleas, about which there has been a struggle among the influential patrons of rival candidates. Pending the settlement of the dispute as to the person to be permanently appointed, the Lord Chief Justice nominated his nephew, a son of a former registrar of the Queen's Bench, and he is now in possession of the office. The Lord Chief Justice at the sitting of the court recently alluded to observations which had been made in some of the public journals, and thought it due to himself and the public, and to the officials, to justify his selection. When the late registrar died, at the end of July last, it became his duty to appoint an *ad interim* officer. The permanent appointment is in the gift of the Lord-Lieutenant, but under peculiar circumstances.

The English and Irish Law and Chancery Commission in 1866 reported against the practice, as at variance with that in England. The Common Law Courts Bill of 1869, and the Judicature Bill of 1874 and of last session, vested the permanent appointment of such officers in the hands of each court. The learned judge described the duties of the clerk, the rules and regulations, and observed that, as they brought him into direct and close communication with the judges, and especially with the chief of the court, it was manifest that he should be a gentleman of intelligence, capacity, education, and social character, with whom the judges could confidentially communicate. Mr. Courteney, for whose appointment he was exclusively responsible, was unexceptionable in his qualifications. He was eligible by law, being a clerk of the court of five years' standing who had entered with the certificate of the Civil Service Commissioners, appointed by the late Chief Baron. He had discharged the duties for four months, and had received certificates from Mr. Justice O'Brien, Mr. Baron Deasy, and Mr. Yeo, clerk of the rules in the Exchequer for many years, testifying in the strongest terms as to his fitness. It had been alleged that he ought to have acted on the rule of seniority in the office; but it did not apply to such an office, and properly did not for the reasons he had indicated.

A sharp and somewhat amusing contrast between ancient and modern notions of law is afforded, says the *American Law Review*, by a recent case of attempted suicide in India (narrated by an English journal):—"A Brahman of the Brahmins" claimed a debt or a concession from an adversary. His importunities being of no avail, he at last avowed his intention of sitting in 'dharna' at the door of the other until his demand should be complied with, or heaven release him from his sufferings, and so cast the blood of the holy upon the head of the obdurate. He accordingly 'sat'; but the operation becoming tedious after a time, and not producing the desired result, he proclaimed his determination to live no longer on the earth with the stiff-necked. With his *janees* in one hand, and dust from the threshold of his oppressor in the other, the Brahman forthwith leaped head foremost into the village well. Seized with terror and remorse, his opponent now rushed forth to the mouth of the fatal well, and, with hands clasped, in contrite tones besought his injured victim to avail himself of the rope thrown down to save him, and only to come up, when all would be well. Thus adjured, the holy man consented to be pulled to the surface of the earth again; whereupon he was seized by his adversary, and handed over to the police on a charge of attempting to commit suicide." Sir Henry Maine, who has found in the Brehon laws remains of a procedure among the ancient Irish analogous to sitting in "dharna" ("Early Hist. of Institutions"), did not naturally discover any trace of such a summary mode of relief from a situation so full of distressing constraint as this must have been to the debtor. Indeed, if we remember rightly, he does not indicate what steps it is supposed a debtor might take. An experience of Adamnan, Abbot of Hy, would seem to show how such a pressure might be withstood:—"The Irish life of Adamnan represents the saint as 'fasting against Irgalach,' immersed in the River Boinn, and overcoming him by decoit. This system of fasting against an obnoxious individual was a favourite mode with the Irish ecclesiastics of bringing down visitations upon their enemies. Irgalach resisted the influence of St. Adamnan's fasting by doing the same himself; until Adamnan, by inducing one of his people to personate him, put Irgalach off his guard, and thus got the mastery over him."

On the election of Mr. Charles Lamb as Mayor of Brighton, his worship, accompanied by the town clerk, attended at the police-court and formally subscribed to the customary oath, in the presence of Mr. A. Biggs, the stipendiary police magistrate, and Alderman Ireland, J.P. When his worship had taken his seat upon the bench as the chief magistrate of the borough, Mr. T. A. Goodman (the clerk to the justices of the Hove Petty Sessions Division) rose and said that, as the senior member of the legal profession present—(his friend, Mr. J. K. Nye, who also attended, being not the senior in practice, although he was so in years)—he desired to ask permission, on behalf of his professional brethren practising at the court, to congratulate Alderman Lamb upon taking his seat as the



chief magistrate of Brighton. It afforded him, he said, the greatest possible pleasure to see the mayor in the high position to which he had been called, for he (Mr. Goodman) had been associated with his worship before commencing his professional career—indeed, he might say for a lifetime; and he was sure that all would agree that there was no one more fitted than Mr. Charles Lamb to fill the office. His knowledge of law, his sound wisdom, and his good judgment would, he was certain, lead him at all times to administer justice with mercy, and mercy with discretion. When he looked back to his earliest associations with Mr. Lamb, before he (the learned gentleman) had entered the profession, it gave him the greatest possible pleasure to be enabled to congratulate him on assuming the dignified office of Mayor of Brighton; and he hoped that his worship would be spared with health and strength to carry out the important duties of the position, and that his legal brethren would often meet him in his judicial capacity in that court. Mr. J. C. Penfold, who meanwhile had entered the court, said he could but add his congratulations to those already expressed by Mr. Goodman. He had very great pleasure in seeing Mr. Lamb take his seat upon the bench, and he hoped that his success would induce other and younger members of the profession to try and emulate his example, and, in future years, hold the position which his worship now so honourably filled. The mayor said he felt very deeply this manifestation of kindly feeling on the part of his professional brethren, and he regarded it as an augury that he should receive their assistance and support during the time he had the honour of occupying a seat upon the bench. It was from the advocates who appeared before them that the bench received their greatest strength; and he was quite satisfied they knew sufficient of him to feel assured that he would do the best he possibly could to hold the scales of justice with an impartial hand. He was always happy to meet his professional brethren on business or other occasions; but the police-court was one of those places from which, perhaps, they would rather be absent; for they sometimes witnessed painful scenes there. He was happy to say, however, that this morning there was no business to be transacted. He sincerely thanked them for their kind expressions, which he felt the more because he knew they were dictated by sincerity. The legal gentlemen then retired.

## Court Papers.

### WINTER ASSIZES.

Mellor, J.—Stafford, Nov. 22; Chester, Dec. 2; Swansea, Dec. 11.  
Lush, J.—Norwich, Nov. 22; Winchester, Dec. 1; Exeter, Dec. 13.  
Lindley, J., and Lopes, J.—Manchester, Nov. 23; Liverpool, Dec. 6.  
Huddleston, B.—Lincoln, Nov. 23; Derby, Nov. 29; Warwick, Dec. 4; Worcester, Dec. 16.  
Hawkins, J.—Durham, Nov. 27; Newcastle, Dec. 4; Leeds, Dec. 11.

### LANCASHIRE WINTER ASSIZES, 1876

The commissions for holding these assizes will be opened at Manchester on Thursday, the 23rd of November, and at Liverpool on Wednesday, the 6th of December.

Causes for trial at Manchester can be entered provisionally at the office of the district registrar and deputy-associate, 57, King-street, Manchester, on Tuesday and Wednesday, the 21st and 22nd of November, during office hours.

Causes for trial at Liverpool can be entered provisionally at the office of the prothonotary and associate, 13, Harrington-street, Liverpool, on Monday and Tuesday, the 4th and 5th of December, during office hours.

The entry of causes at Manchester and Liverpool respectively will commence at the assize courts, Manchester, and St. George's Hall, Liverpool, immediately after the opening of the commissions, and will close at nine o'clock on the evening of the commission day.

Civil business at Manchester will not be taken before Tuesday, the 28th of November, at ten o'clock in the fore-

noon. The court will sit at Liverpool on Thursday, the 7th of December, at eleven o'clock in the forenoon.

The trial of special jury causes will commence at Manchester on Thursday, the 30th of November, at ten o'clock in the forenoon, and at Liverpool on Monday, the 11th of December, at the same hour, unless the court shall otherwise order.

A list of causes for trial at Manchester and Liverpool, respectively, each day (except the first) will be exhibited in the corridor of the court and in the library.

By order of the judges, T. E. PAGET.  
Prothonotary's office, Liverpool, Nov. 16.

## CONTEMPT OF COURT.

In the case of *Storey v. The People*, recently before the Illinois Supreme Court, the facts were that in March, 1875, the grand jury for Cook County returned against Storey, who was then the editor of a newspaper, three indictments for libel, and one for publishing an obscene newspaper. Thereupon there appeared in Storey's paper a series of violent and abusive articles, attacking the integrity of the jury as a body, and the characters of its individual members. The jury appealed to the court for protection. Storey was called before the court, and committed to gaol for contempt. An application was made to the Supreme Court in his behalf, and he was discharged on bail. It appears from the case before the Supreme Court that all the indictments against Storey had been returned before the publication of the article complained of; and that, at the time of their publication, Storey had no knowledge or belief that there were any other complaints pending against him. There did not appear to be any allegation that the publication was calculated to prevent the obtaining a competent *petit jury* to try the indictments, or that the presiding judge would be affected thereby. The only question, then, was, assuming the articles to be libellous, whether the publication of a libel on a grand jury because of an act already done may be summarily punished as contempt. The court held that it cannot. After citing *The Queen v. Lefroy* (23 W. R. 332, L. R. 8 Q. B. 134), where it is said the superior courts "were carved out of the one supreme court, and were all divisions of the *aula regis*, where it is said the king in person dispensed justice, and their power of committing for contempt was an emanation of the Royal authority, for any contempt of the court would be a contempt of the Sovereign," the opinion proceeds:—

"The theory of government requiring Royalty to be invested with an imaginary perfection, which forbids question or discussion, is diametrically opposed to our theory of popular government, in which the utmost latitude and freedom in the discussion of business affecting the public, and the conduct of those who fill positions of public trust, that is consistent with truth and decency, are not only allowable, but essential to the public welfare.

"The common law mode of proceeding in cases of contempt presents no question of fact to be tried by a jury. The defendant determines by his own answer, under oath, whether he is guilty of that which is charged against him as a contempt of court; and, if he fails thereby to purge himself, the court may at once impose the punishment.

"The law of libel at common law left the jury to determine whether the defendant was guilty of the publication alone; but the question of whether the publication was libellous was for the court, and it was admissible to show by evidence that the publication was true, or the motive with which the publication was made. Whether, therefore, the party charged with the libel was tried by a jury, or proceeded against summarily as for contempt, the only question of fact was, whether he was guilty of the publication.

"In this State, however, our Constitution guarantees 'that every person may freely speak, write, and publish on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of that liberty; and in all trials for libel, both civil and criminal, the truth, when published with good motives and justifiable ends, shall be a sufficient defence.'

"This language, plain and explicit as it is, cannot be held to have no application to courts, or those by whom they are conducted. The judiciary is elective; and the jurors, although appointed, are, in general, appointed by a

Board whose members are elected by popular vote. There is, therefore, the same responsibility, in theory, in the judicial department, that exists in the legislative and executive departments, to the people for the diligent and faithful discharge of all duties enjoined on it; and the same necessity for public information with regard to the conduct and character of those intrusted to discharge those duties, in order that the elective franchise shall be intelligently exercised, as obtains in regard to the other departments of the Government.

"When it is conceded that the guaranty of this clause of the Constitution extends to words spoken or published in regard to judicial conduct and character, it would seem necessarily to follow that the defendant has the right to make a defence which can only be properly tried by a jury, and which the judge of a court, especially if he is himself the subject of the publication, is unfitted to try.

"Entertaining these views, the judgment of the court below must be reversed, and the respondent discharged."

### RUFUS CHOATE.

MR. G. W. MINNS, writing in the *American Law Review*, says:—I remember Choate's saying, "Never browbeat a witness on the cross-examination: it only makes him more obstinate and hostile. When I began to practise law, I used to think it very fine to be severe, and even savage, towards my opponent's witnesses; but I soon found it would not do, and I reformed my method altogether. Violence does no good; the gentle method is the best. It is the old story of the son and the wind." His courtesy to witnesses was well known, and also the fact that he drew more from the most reluctant witness by the skill and suavity of his examination than others by harshness, or attempts to intimidate.

Mr. Choate related the following anecdote of his early life to a young member of the Suffolk bar who was regretting some mistake or oversight he had made: One stormy night, during his residence in Danvers, he was called upon at a late hour to draw up the will of a dying man who lived several miles distant. He went, performed the service, and returned home. But after going to bed, as he lay revolving in his mind each provision of the paper he had so rapidly prepared, there flashed across his memory an omission that might cause the testator's intention to be misunderstood. He sprang from his bed, and began dressing himself rapidly, to the great surprise of his wife; only answering her inquiries by saying that he had done what must be undone, and, in the thick of the storm, rode again to his dying client, explained the reason of his return, and drew a codicil to the will which made everything sure. Mr. Choate then added, "A clever man will blunder sometimes; but a blockhead blunders—*ex vi termini*."

A blacksmith having failed in business, a friend, to enable him to start once more, loaned him some iron, which a creditor attached at the forge. The friendly owner sued in trover for his iron. Choate appeared for him, and pictured the cruelty of the sheriff's proceeding as follows:—"He arrested the arm of industry as it fell towards the anvil; he put out the breath of his bellows; he extinguished the fire upon his hearth-stone. Like pirates in a gale at sea, his enemies swept everything by the board, leaving him, gentlemen of the jury, not so much—not so much as a horse-shoe to nail upon his door-post to keep the witches off." The tears came into the blacksmith's eyes at this affecting description. One of his friends, noticing them, said to him, "Why, Tom, what's the matter with you? What are you blubbering about?"—"I had no idea," was the reply in a whimpering tone—"I had no idea I had been so much a-a-a-bused!" Nor had he, till Choate told him.

At a trial of a cashier of one of the South Boston banks, charged with embezzlement, Choate, who appeared for the defence, argued that the cashier was compelled to do what he had done by his superior officers, the directors; that they had swindled the public; that they were the responsible parties, and should suffer the punishment. He was proceeding to flay the directors, when one of them rose in court, and, in great anger, began to denounce Choate, who, hardly allowing himself to be interrupted, said mildly, "I beg the director to be seated, as he wishes to be treated with moderation in a court of justice." And then, instantly breaking out into a scream, and with the greatest impetuosity, he exclaimed, "I tell you, gentlemen of the jury, my client

was as helpless in the hands of these directors as an infant surrounded by ten thousand Bengal tigers!" I give this as a specimen of the extravagance which Choate sometimes allowed himself. No one, however, smiled; every one looked grave, and full of sympathy for the unfortunate infant thus encircled, and ready to bewail the inevitable catastrophe. It is well known that Choate could say and do things in court that in other men would have excited shouts of laughter, but which, coming from him, produced no such effect. The reason was his intense earnestness.

Mr. Choate's indifference to money was well known. He undoubtedly lost thousands of dollars by carelessness in collecting, and negligence in charging for his services. The only account-book he kept while I was with him was his office-docket, in which actions were entered by any one in his office who made out a writ. He would sometimes come into the office, and exclaim, "My kingdom for 500dols.—for 400dols.—100dols. ! Where does the money go? No matter where. Where shall it come from? That's the question of the hour, the minute. Upon whom shall I make a raid? Let me see." And he would turn to his docket, and, after I had made out a few bills from the particulars given me, receipt them, and ask me to collect them. I seldom found any difficulty in collecting, and no one objected to the charges. Sometimes, when a man did not pay, Mr. Choate would ask me to get his note, which he indorsed, sent to a bank to be discounted, and, at maturity, perhaps had to take it up himself.

He subsequently got a cash-book and entered, as the first item, "The office debtor to one quart of oil, 37½ cents." The next entry was six months later, and closed the record. I have heard of another account-book, in which the only entry was a debit for the price of the book.

A member of the bar called upon him to induce him to be senior counsel in defence of a man accused of murder, and, in the course of the conversation, stated that his client had no money. "What!" exclaimed Choate, "hands reeking with human blood, and not a cent in his pocket! Outrageous!"

On a very hot day, Mr. Choate was arguing a case at a law term of the Supreme Court, before the full bench. He evidently had the wrong side. Besides other cases against him, a decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania had been cited, which was exactly in point, and conclusive against his positions. He was apparently in the full tide of successful argument, and was approaching its end, when the Chief Justice said, "What do you say to the Pennsylvania case, Mr. Choate?" "Your honours, I have not forgotten that case. By no means. I was coming to it directly. By turning to it, you will notice that the decision was given in the month of July, in the height of the hot season, in the extremely hot town of Harrisburgh, in the interior of the State, far away from the ocean breezes which here, at this moment, are beginning to fan the heated brow of justice. We all know that Homer sometimes nods; and I submit to your honours whether it is not indisputable that the judges of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania—convened in the very heated interior of the State, in the extremely hot month of July, probably on one of the hottest days of that month, and in the afternoon, as the report fortunately happens to inform us—were, at the time of pronouncing this abnormal decision on which my brother so much relies, either most of them profoundly asleep, or all 'nodding, nid, nid, nodding,' and so not responsible for the strange doctrines laid down." There was great merriment among the judges, and it was increased by the profound gravity of Choate. The Chief Justice (Shaw) shook his sides till I thought he would roll off his chair.

A story circulated in the office, for the truth of which I do not vouch. I only "tell the tale as 'twas told to me." A stranger called upon Mr. Choate, and said that he had come to him, as the head of the Suffolk bar, to consult him upon a matter very important to himself. It seems, that, at an hotel, the man had had a dispute with one of the waiters, who finally told him to go to h—l. "Now," he continued with an air of great importance, "I ask you, Mr. Choate, as one learned in the law, and as my legal adviser, what course, under these very aggravating circumstances, it is best for me, in your judgment, to pursue?" Choate requested him to state again, in order of time, everything that occurred, and to be careful not to omit anything, and, when this had been done, remained

for a few moments as if lost in deep thought. At last, with the utmost gravity, he spoke: "I have been running over in my mind all the statutes of the United States, all the statutes of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and all the decisions of all the judges thereon, and I am satisfied there is nothing in them that will require you to go to the place you have mentioned; and don't you go." The man, it is presumed, followed this good advice.

A member of the bar tells me, that at the time of the trial of the *Tufts Will* case, in which Webster and Choate were counsel for the plaintiff, and Samuel Hoar and Augustus Peabody for the defendant, he was dining at Parker's restaurant, which was then in the basement of the building on the corner of Court-street and Court-square. Webster and Choate were seated at the next table in the public dining-room. Mr. Choate, as junior counsel, had finished his work in the case, and, as usual with him at such a time, was nervous and indisposed, and partook of nothing but tea and toast. Webster, on the other hand, although he was to make his argument in the afternoon, was indulging in beef, ale, and brandy and water, *ad libitum*, and was as comfortable as if he had a month's vacation before him. When the court-house bell rang, Webster went into court, and soon commenced his argument, apparently without having taken any time to prepare it. His first remark, in reference to some rather angry discussion that had taken place, was, "My advice to my brother is, to keep cool; and let him always remember that truth is a pearl to be obtained only in still waters." At its close, Choate came to his office, where he exclaimed most enthusiastically, "The greatest argument Webster ever made! Magnificent beyond even the powerful appeal he made in the *Knapp* case for the admission of the confession of the prisoner!" Some one then asked Choate what he thought of Jeremiah Mason, who had previously been employed in the *Tufts* case. "A very great lawyer," he replied; "but he is not juicy."

I never saw Choate lose his self-possession in court, except once. He was arguing a case to a jury, Judge Wilde presiding. The judge interrupted him with the remark, "Mr. Choate, the witness did not make the statement you attribute to him." "With your honour's permission, I will say that I cannot be mistaken. I took down every word the witness uttered, and have it here in black and white, just as I have stated. If your honour will look at my notes, you will find it so." Turning to the jury, he went on: "Just as I have told you, gentlemen of the jury, the witness testified;" and he then repeated the statement. The judge, again interrupting, said gruffly, "I don't want to look at your notes, Mr. Choate; and, if I did, you know I could make nothing of them. The witness did not say what you state." Then leaning forward, and pointing his finger at Choate, he continued: "You wanted him to say so and so, Mr. Choate, and you did your best to try and make him; but you couldn't do it." Choate stood for a few moments silent, evidently embarrassed, and then took up another part of the case.

## PUBLIC COMPANIES.

November 17, 1876.

### GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

3 per Cent. Consols, 94½  
 Ditto for Account, Dec. 1, 94½  
 Do 3 per Cent. Reduced, 94½  
 New 3 per Cent., 94½  
 Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94  
 Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94  
 Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '79  
 Annuities, Jan. '80 —

Annuities, April, '81, 92  
 Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1908  
 Ex Billa, £1000, 2½ per Ct. 2 pm  
 Ditto, £500, Do, 27 p2m  
 Ditto, £100 & £500, 27 pm.  
 Bank of England Stock. — per  
 Ct. (last half-year), 257  
 Ditto for Account.

### INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '89, 107½  
 Ditto for Account. —  
 Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '89, 102½  
 Ditto, ditto, Certificates —  
 Ditto En faced Ppr., 4 per Cent. 85  
 2nd Inf. Fr., 5 per C., Jan. '72

Ditto 5½ per Cent., May, '79, 85  
 Ditto Debentures, 4 per Cent.  
 April, '84  
 Do. Do. 5 per Cent., Aug. '73  
 Do. Bonds, 4 per Cent. £1000  
 Ditto, ditto, under £1000

## RAILWAY STOCK.

Railways.	Paid.	Closing Prices
Stock Bristol and Exeter .....	100	—
Stock Caledonian .....	100	120½
Stock Glasgow and South-Western .....	100	106
Stock Great Eastern Ordinary Stock .....	100	80½
Stock Great Northern .....	100	134
Stock Do., A Stock .....	100	141
Stock Great Southern and Western of Ireland .....	100	—
Stock Great Western—Original .....	100	105½
Stock Lancashire and Yorkshire .....	100	135½
Stock London, Brighton, and South Coast .....	100	117½
Stock London, Chatham, and Dover .....	100	21½
Stock London and North-Western .....	100	145½
Stock London and South-Western .....	100	129½
Stock Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln .....	100	71
Stock Metropolitan .....	100	105½
Stock Do., District .....	100	48
Stock Midland .....	100	134
Stock North British .....	100	105
Stock North Eastern .....	100	187½
Stock North London .....	100	137
Stock North Staffordshire .....	100	67
Stock North Devon .....	100	69
Stock South-Eastern .....	100	127

\* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

## BIRTH.

HUTTON—Nov. 7, at 9, Upper George-street, Bryanston-square, the wife of William J. Hutton, of a daughter.

## LONDON GAZETTES.

### Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

FRIDAY, Nov. 10, 1876.

Gresham, William, and Thomas Gresham, 244, Basinghall st, London, Solicitors and Attorneys. Oct 30  
 Handley, John Jesse, and George Walkden, Mansfield, Nottingham, Solicitors and Conveyancers. Nov 2

### Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, Nov. 10, 1876.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Basse Consolidated Silver Mine, Limited.—V.C. Hall has, by an order dated June 23, appointed A. Fred Good, Poultry, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before Jan 10, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to the above. Wednesday, Jan 24, at 1.30, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims  
 Church and Empire Fire Insurance Fund, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Hall, dated Nov 3, it was ordered that the above fund be wound up. Carter, Old Jewry chambers, solicitor for the petitioner

Scart Barytes and Minerals Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Nov 7, directed to be heard before the M.R. on Nov 18. Bell and Co, Bow churchyard, solicitors for the petitioner

### COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.

National Industrial Sanitary Dwellings Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Nov 8, directed to be heard before the V.C. on Nov 28. Higson and Son, Manchester, solicitors for the petitioner

### STANNARIES OF DEVON.

Tamar Valley Silver Lead Mining Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Nov 4, directed to be heard before the Vice Warden, at the Princes Hall, Truro, on Friday, Nov 24, at 11. Affidavits intended to be used at the hearing in opposition to the petition, must be filed at the registrar's office, Truro, on or before Nov 22, and notice thereof must at the same time be given to the petitioners, their solicitors, or their agent. Paul, Truro, agent for Cools and Co, St Austell, solicitors for the petitioners

### TUESDAY, Nov. 14, 1876.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Barnett's Patent Asphalt Paving Company, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Bacon, dated Nov 4, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Vallance and Vallance, Essex st, Strand, solicitors for the petitioners

Baywater Club and Skating Rink Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Nov 8, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall on Nov 24. Silberberg, Cornhill, solicitor for the petitioner  
 Belmont and Carriker's Salt Works, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Hall, dated Nov 3, it was ordered that the above works be wound up. Attenborough, St Paul's churchyard, agent for Salmo, Ulverston, solicitor for the petitioner

Gaudet Freres London and Paris Steamship Company, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Malins, dated Nov 3, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Abrahams and Roddy, Old Jewry, solicitors for the petitioners

Gaudet Freres London and Paris Steamship Company, Limited.—V.C. Malins has fixed Nov 24, at 11.30, at his chambers, as the time and place for the appointment of an official liquidator



**Kilpass Gas Consumers' Company, Limited.**—Upon the hearing of this petition on Nov 4, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of above company be continued. Duncan and Co, agents for Dunning and Kay, Leeds.

**Koehler Meat Supply Association, Limited.**—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 11, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to George William Wood, Sarnbrook court, Basinghall st. Thursday, Dec 21, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudication upon the debts and claims.

**Westbourne Grove Drapery and Furnishing Company, Limited.**—By an order made by V.C. Bacon, dated Nov 4, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the above company be continued. Lewis and Co, Old Jewry, solicitors for the petitioner.

#### COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.

**Prescot Masonic Hall Company, Limited.**—By an order made by the V.C. dated Nov 7, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Mather, Liverpool, solicitor for the petitioner.

#### Friendly Societies Dissolved.

FRIDAY, Nov. 10, 1876.

Christ Church Union Society, Bush Inn, West Bromwich, Stafford. Nov 6.

TUESDAY, Nov. 14, 1876.

Wellington Traders' Friendly Society, Horseshoe Inn, Wellington, Northampton. Oct 12.

#### Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

TUESDAY, Nov. 7, 1876.

Adams, Richard, Portsea, Hants. Gent. Dec 9. Thompson v Leggatt, V.C. Malins. Feltham, Portsea.  
Bailie, Ann, Streethay, Lichfield, Stafford. Dec 4. Bailie v Bailie, M.R. Barnes, Lichfield.  
Bailie, Thomas, Streethay, Lichfield, Stafford, Gent. Dec 4.  
Bailie v Bailie, M.R. Barnes, Lichfield.  
Dunolly, Procia, Florence, Italy. Jan 16. Dunolly v Austey, V.C. Bacon. Somerville, Lincoln's inn fields.  
Granger, John, Bridlington Quay, York, Esq. Dec 4. Gowan v Granger, M.R. Worthington and Co, Eastcheap.  
Harned, Henry, Ditchampton, Wilts. Yeoman. Dec 4. Harman v Rogers, M.R. Cobb and Smith, Salisbury.  
Harrington, George, Nymans, Cuckfield, Sussex, Esq. Dec 4. Browne v Hill, M.R. Hill and Co, Brighton.  
Jones, David Parry, Ezergrais, Cardigan, Gent. Dec 2. Lloyd v Jones, V.C. Malins. Lloyd, Haverfordwest.  
Taylor, Ann, Newark-upon-Trent, Nottingham, Chemist. Dec 11. King v Taylor, V.O. Hall. Newton, Newark-upon-Trent.  
Young, William, Freshute, Wilts. Yeoman. Dec 1. Sawyer v Hillier, V.C. Malins. Day, Devizes.

FRIDAY, Nov. 10, 1876.

Adams, Robert, Kensington park gardens, Merchant. Dec 4. Pass v Dundas, V.C. Bacon. Stubbard, Fenchurch st.  
Barnicot, Joseph, Avenue rd, Regent's park, Gent. Dec 5. Wood v Barnicot, M.R. Heather, Paternoster row.  
Derm, Alfred, Eastcheap, Merchant. Dec 9. Deem v Munden, M.R. Peddell, Guildhall chambers, Basinghall st.  
Fawcus, Isabella, Tynemouth. Dec 15. Black v Fawcus, V.C. Hall. Chartres, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.  
Gladstone, William, Old Broad st, Esq. Dec 30. Gladstone v Gladstone, V.C. Malins. Norton, Coleman st.  
Hattersley, John, Quasimby, Huddersfield, York. Dec 2. Hattersley v Haigh, V.C. Bacon. Owen, Huddersfield.  
Johnson, Samuel, Rowley Regis, Stafford, Timber Dealer. Dec 11. Thompson v Johnson, V.C. Hall. Griffin, Birmingham.  
McBay, William, South Shields, Durham, Master Mariner. Dec 9. McBay v McBay, V.C. Malins. Kimber, Lombard st.  
Maitland, Caroline, Loudoun rd, St John's wood. Dec 15. Ancona v Waddell, V.C. Hall. Watkins and Co, Saville st.  
Murett, Frederick, Cambridge rd, Bethnal green, Builder. Dec 5. Murett v Murett, V.C. Hall. Webb, Anastasiadis.  
Parsons, Mrs. Cecil, Presteign, Radnor, Banker. Dec 21. Russell v Parsons, V.C. Hall. Watchin, Presteign.  
Rogers, William, Welton, Kent. Dec 9. Rogers v Crabbe, V.C. Malins. Powys, Lincoln's inn fields.  
Smith, Matilda, Leamington, Warwick. Dec 31. Smith v Pope, V.C. Hall. Gamlen and Son, Gray's inn sq.  
Wells, James, Bloxwich, Stafford, Gent. Dec 5. McMann v Daniells, M.R. Rankin, Westbromwich.  
Wells, Louisa, Crundale rd, Camden town. Dec 6. Haslegrave v Goodfrie, M.R. Brook, New inn, Strand.

TUESDAY, Nov. 14, 1876.

Conway, James, Liverpool, Esq. Dec 9. Conway v Conway, M.R. Orford, Manchester.  
Godfrey, Henry, William, Hatfield, York, Gent. Dec 11. Godfrey v Godfrey, V.C. Malins. Champney, Kingston-upon-Hull.  
Rawstron, James, Aiden, Lancashire, Cotton spinner. Dec 1. Maxwell v Rawstron, V.C. Malins. Hall, Acerrington.

#### Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, Nov. 10, 1876.

Anderson, William, Seymour st, Hyde park, Esq. Dec 23. Burne and Parker, Lincoln's inn fields.  
Dean, Isabella, Tunbridge Wells, Kent. Jan 1. Stevens and Co, Coleman st.  
Bowell, Anna, Markham sq, Chelsea. Jan 1. Budham, Salters' Hall court, Cannon st.  
Brown, Emily, Clarence terrace, Regent's park. Jan 10. Storey, King's rd, Bedford row.  
Butt, Henry John, Hyde, Isle of Wight, Esq. Dec 22. Wynne and Son, Lincoln's inn fields.  
Corns, Arthur Brian, Long Eaton, Derby. Dec 11. Brittle, Nottingham.

Dixon, James, Stapleford Abbots, Essex, Shopkeeper. Dec 24. Surridge and Co, Lombard st.  
Farnshaw, George, Knottingley, York, Innkeeper. Dec 9. Foster and Richards, Ponemract.  
Erpe, Robert, Findern, Derby, Gent. Jan 7. Sales, Derby.  
Fox, Henry Lane, Grosvenor st, Esq. Dec 23. Farrer and Co, Lincoln's inn fields.  
Hardy, Benjamin, Upper avenue rd, Esq. Dec 10. Parkers, Bedford row.  
Hawkins, Sophia, Plymouth, Devon. Jan 10. Edmonds and Son, Plymouth.  
Hopkins, William, Combes End, Gloucester, Yeoman. Dec 23. Trenchfield, Chipping Sodbury.  
Jones, Thomas Charles, Liverpool, Master Mariner. Dec 7. Forrest, Liverpool.  
Kershaw, John Evans, Henrietta st, Covent garden. Dec 12. Cobbett and Co, Manchester.  
Lawrence, John Glover, Liverpool, Solicitor. Dec 1. Lawrence and Dixon, Liverpool.  
Lawrence, Sarah Ellen, Fairfield, nr Liverpool. Dec 1. Lawrence and Dixon, Liverpool.  
Lemon, John Lionel, Sheffield, Theatrical Manager. Dec 13. Newbould and Gould, Sheffield.  
Livermore, Ann, Upminster, Essex. Dec 24. Surridge and Co, Lombard st.  
Penfold, William, Marreson, Preston, Sussex, Esq. Jan 7. Barker and Lane, Bedford row.  
Playford, Robert, Twaite, Norfolk, Gent. Dec 22. Norton, Bengay.  
Robson, Robert, Gateshead, Engine Driver. Nov 30. Robson, Gateshead.  
Roper, William Robert, Winterborne Clenstone, Dorset, Yeoman. Jan 1. Symonds and Son, Dorchester.  
Royle, George, Newton Moor, Cheshire, Butcher. Nov 27. Marsh and Coppock, Stockport.  
Schulz, Eduard, Conduit st, Bond st, Gent. Jan 1. Badham, Salters' Hall court Cannon st.  
Shepard, Richard, Upper st, Islington, Fancy Jeweller. Dec 30. Lawrence, Goddman st, St Paul's churchyard.  
Smith, Joseph, Matlock, Derby, Gent. Jan 8. Cutts and Co, Chesterfield.  
Southam, George, Pendleton, Lancashire, Surgeon. Dec 30. Cunliffe and Co, Manchester.  
Storey, Thomas, Hamby, York, Gent. Jan 1. Teale, Middlesbrough.  
Studley, John, Seaborough, Somerset, Esq. Jan 10. Symonds and Son, Dorchester.  
Taitor, Sir Charles, Biggleswade, Bedford, Admiral R.N. Jan 1. Walker and Co, King's rd, Gray's inn.  
Taylor, Herbert Edward, Dover, Kent, Esq. Dec 13. Bircham and Co, Parliament st, Westminster.  
Trewicke, Rev George, Napleton, Southsea, Hants. Jan 9. Barker and Lane, Bedford row.  
Wightman, Mary, Norton, York. Jan 1. Jagger, New Malton.  
Williams, Margaret, Waterloo, nr Liverpool. Dec 1. Toulmin and Co, Liverpool.  
Winter, James, Norfolk, Gent. Jan 1. Winter and Francis, Norwich.

#### Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, Nov. 10, 1876.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar. To Surrender in London.

Knight, Douglas, Alpha place, Canterbury rd, Kilbarn, Grocer. Pet Nov 7. Hazlit. Nov 22 at 12.

To Surrender in the Country.

Hamburger, S., Birmingham, Jewellers' Factor. Pet Nov 7. Cole. Birmingham, Nov 20 at 3.  
Hunt, George, Warwick, Hove, nr Brighton, Gent. Pet Nov 8. Evershed. Brighton, Nov 29 at 11.  
Myring, Charles, Birmingham, Saddler. Pet Nov 6. Parry. Birmingham, Nov 24 at 2.  
Stafford, Francis, Ilkeston, Derby, Tobacconist. Pet Nov 8. Weller. Derby, Nov 29 at 12.

TUESDAY, Nov. 14, 1876.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar. To Surrender in the Country.

Backhouse, Thomas, New Beckenham, Kent. Pet Nov 6. Rowland, Croydon, Nov 24 at 2.  
Evans, David, Skewen, nr Neath, Builder. Pet Nov 8. Jones. Neath, Nov 27 at 2.  
Hutchinson, John Joseph William, Birmingham, Clock Case Manufacturer. Pet Nov 7. Parry. Birmingham, Nov 29 at 2.  
Kave, John, Huddersfield, Rope-maker. Pet Nov 9. Jones, Jan. Huddersfield, Nov 30 at 11.  
Lawrence, James, Poole, Grocer. Pet Nov 10. Dickinson. Poole, Nov 27 at 11.  
Wood, Charles, Leeds, Innkeeper. Pet Nov 8. Marshall. Leeds, Dec 6 at 11.

#### BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

TUESDAY, Nov. 14, 1876.

Egerer, Charles, Mark lane, Merchant. Nov 4. Lee, E. G., Princess st, Cavendish sq. Nov 4.  
Priestley, Thomas, and Simeon Priestley, Halifax, Woolstaplers. Oct 24.

#### Liquidation by Arrangement.

#### FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, Nov. 10, 1876.

Aitken, Martin Irving, Alfred, Lincoln, Flax Dresser. Nov 21 at 3 at office of Walker and Co, Alfred.  
Archer, William, Chorley, Lancashire, Beer-seller. Nov 23 at 11 at office of Morris, Town hall chambers, Chorley.  
Armer, Charles Wmship, Gateshead, Grocer. Nov 23 at 11 at office of Allan and Davies, Grainger st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Ashworth, William, Nottingham, out of business. Nov 24 at 12 at offices of Wells and Hind, Fletchergate, Nottingham

Barker, George, Wednesbury, Stafford, Grocer. Nov 23 at 3 at offices of Sheldon, High st, Wednesbury

Beards, Benbon, Wolverhampton, General Dealer. Nov 23 at 11 at offices of Stratton and Rudland, Queen st, Wolverhampton

Bennett, Sarah, Nottingham, Draper. Nov 23 at 12 at offices of Belk, Middle pavement, Nottingham

Bentley, John, Birmingham, Journeyman Tallow Chandler. Nov 22 at 3 at offices of Beaton, Victoria buildings, Temple row, Birmingham

Bentley, Samuel, Bradford, Bookseller. Nov 22 at 1 at offices of Rooke and Midgley, White Horse st, Boar lane, Leeds

Bird, Alfred Greenwood, Leeds, Shoe Merchant. Nov 24 at 2 at offices of Rooke and Midgley, White Horse st, Boar lane, Leeds

Bliss, George, Bakley Lanes, Buckingham, Farmer. Nov 21 at 11 at offices of Jeffery, Market sq, Northampton

Blunt, Thomas, Birmingham. Nov 30 at 11 at offices of Duke, Temple row, Birmingham

Booth, Thomas, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Provision Dealer. Nov 24 at 3 at offices of Johnston, Pilgrim st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Brawley, Philip, Wakefield, Horse Breaker. Dec 1 at 1 at the Manor House Inn, Westgate, Wakefield. Stringer

Brewster, George, Enoch, Kingston-upon-Hull, Smeak Owner. Nov 22 at 11 at offices of Shackles and Son, Land of Green Ginger, Kingston-upon-Hull

Burton, Robert, jun, Harlethorpe, York, Farmer. Nov 24 at 11 at offices of Burton, New lane, Selby

Cain, George Robert, Radcliffe, Lancashire, Saddler. Nov 22 at 3 at offices of Rutter, Mawdaley st, Bolton

Calderwood, George, Castle st, Falcon sq, Manufacturer. Nov 22 at 2 at offices of Webb, Barbican chambers, Barbican

Catchpole, John Grayston, Pont 4, Belgrave sq, Fruiterer. Nov 20 at 11 at the Bedford Hotel, Maiden lane, Covent garden. Button and Co, Henrietta, Covent garden

Cash, Frederick, and John Davis, Birmingham, Umbrella Furniture Manufacturers. Nov 27 at 3 at offices of Rowlands and Bagnall, Colmore row, Birmingham

Clarke, George, and William Pike, Tabernacle walk, Finsbury, Boot Manufacturers. Nov 23 at 12 at offices of French, Crutched friars

Colins, George, Cardiff, Greengrocer. Nov 20 at 11 at offices of Morgan, High st, Cardiff

Cooper, Edwin, Stratford-on-Avon, Victualler. Nov 27 at 11 at the Falcon Hotel, Stratford-on-Avon. Lane, Stratford-on-Avon

Cope, John, Cardiff, Shipwright. Nov 22 at 11 at offices of Morgan, High st, Cardiff

Cosh, Richard Lawrence, Brighton, out of business. Nov 30 at 3 at offices of Slater and Pannells, Guildhall chambers, Basinghall st

Curry, Robert, Liverpool, Greengrocer. Nov 29 at 3 at offices of Nordson, Cook st, Liverpool

Davies, Edward, Dinas, nr Pontypridd, Contractor. Nov 23 at 12 at the Public Hall Offices, Treherbert. Howells

Dawes, William, Birmingham, out of business. Nov 25 at 11.30 at offices of Ward, Moor st, Birmingham

Earl, Samuel, Uppre Weacon, Non-hampton, Farmer. Nov 23 at 3 at offices of Becke, Derrigate, Northampton

Emery, Robert, Cardiff, Merchant. Nov 28 at 3 at offices of Williams and Co, Albert chambers, High st, Cardiff. Ingledew and Co, Cardiff

Everitt, Robert, Ilminster, Somerset, Superintendent of Police. Nov 28 at 11 at offices of Paul, Ilminster

Faulkner, Israel, Houghton, Lancashire, out of business. Nov 22 at 3 at the White Horse Hotel, Denton

Floury, Eugene Lucien, Berners st, Dealer in Mantles. Nov 25 at 2 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Froggatt, Argyl st, Regent st

Forknall, Heziah, Leicester, Fancy Box Manufacturer. Nov 24 at 3 at offices of Wright, Belvoir st, Leicester

Foster, Frederick, Leamington Spa, Builder. Nov 23 at 12 at offices of Sanders, Church st, Warwick

Foster, John Jones, Liverpool, Iron Founder. Nov 27 at 3 at offices of Yates and Co, Water st, Liverpool

Gregg, Peter William, Mile End rd, Confectioner. Nov 18 at 10 at 152 Westminster bridge rd. Goatly, Bow st

Harris, Thomas, Victoria, Mon, Contractor. Nov 25 at 10 at offices of David, Tredgar chambers, Newport

Heald, George Fenton, Sheffield, Organ Builder. Nov 22 at 12 at offices of Hodgson, Bank st, Sheffield

Hinchcliffe, James, and James Pilling, Manchester Gray Cloth Agents. Nov 21 at 3 at offices of Fox, Princess st, Manchester

Hodgson, William, Bristol, Umbrella Maker. Nov 24 at 12 at offices of Plummer, Nicholas st, Bristol

Hornesey, George, Southampton, Gasfitter. Nov 20 at 3 at offices of Edmunds and Co, Old Jewry. Shute, Southampton

Hunt, Harry, Aston, nr Birmingham, out of business. Nov 24 at 11 at offices of Smith, Temple st, Birmingham

Hunt, Charles, Leeds, out of business. Nov 21 at 11 at offices of Hewson, East parade, Leeds

Hurrell, Robert, Lower Thames st, Carman. Nov 20 at 11 at the Macons' Hall Tavern, Macons' avenue, Basinghall st, Rigby, Berensford st, Walworth

Hydes, John, and Samuel Judd, Hanslet, Leeds, Bill Discounters. Nov 22 at 2 at offices of Simpson and Burrell, Albion st, Leeds

Jackson, William, Gainsborough, Lincoln, Ironmonger. Nov 22 at 1 at the Exchange Hotel, Sheffield. Oldman and Iveson, Gainsborough

Jenks, Thomas Jones, Birmingham, Jeweller. Nov 18 at 11 at the Union Hotel, Union st, Birmingham. East, Birmingham

Jobling, George, Leven Bridge, York, Innkeeper. Nov 24 at 11.30 at offices of Hudson and Pybus, Dovecot st, Stockton-on-Tees. Garbutt and Fawcett, Stockton-on-Tees

Jones, Thomas Griffith, Neath, Glamorgan, Iron Merchant. Nov 23 at 12 at offices of Leyson, James st, Neath

Kay, Mary Ann, Worthington, Cumberland, Milliner. Dec 1 at 12 at the Globe Hotel, Cockermouth. Atter, Whitehaven

Lane, Mary J, Kimberley, Nottingham. Nov 29 at 12 at offices of Cockayne, Fletchergate, Nottingham

Lewis, William, Birmingham, Jeweller. Nov 23 at 3 at offices of Jacques, Cherry st, Birmingham

Little, Narborough Hoxley John, Fleet st, Wine Merchant. Nov 21 at 11 at Dick's Coffee House, Fleet st. Johnson, Arandel st, Strand

Martin, John Robert, Lincoln, Joiner. Nov 18 at 11 at offices of Jay, Bank st, Lincoln. Rex, Lincoln

Maxfield, Henry Thomas, Leicester, Elastic Web Manufacturer. Nov 23 at 12 at offices of Wright, Gallowtree gate, Leicester

Metcalf, George, Oak Style, York, Farmer. Nov 22 at 11 at the Bay Horse Inn, Matham. Culvert, Matham

Meyer, Alfred Kaufmann, Sheffield, Factor. Nov 24 at 11 at offices of Binney and Sons, Queen st chambers, Sheffield

Mole, John, Consett, Durham, Bootmaker. Nov 22 at 2 at offices of Jools, Newgate st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Moore, John Morris, Kenilworth, Warwick, Farmer. Nov 17 at 3 at the Globe Hotel, Warwick. Pain and Hawtin

Nixon, James, Hastings, Wine Merchant. Nov 20 at 3 at 111, Cheap-side. Plunkett, Gutter lane, Cheapside

Noble, James, Stockton, out of business. Nov 27 at 12 at offices of Thompson, High st, Stockton-on-Tees. Trotter, Stockton-on-Tees

Parker, Evan, Neath, Glamorgan, Builder. Nov 24 at 1.30 at offices of Simons and Flewa, Church st, Marthyr Tydyl

Parker, George, and Rawnsley Fieldhouse, New Wortley, nr Leeds, Joiners. Nov 21 at 3 at offices of Lodge, Park row, Leeds

Parker, John, London rd, Clapton, Builder. Nov 23 at 2 at the Cannon st Hotel. O'Neill, King William st

Parkinson, Richard, Quernmore, Lancashire, out of business. Nov 29 at 2 at offices of Sharp and Son, Cable st, Lancaster

Peel, Robert Peel, Bradford, Grocer. Nov 22 at 4 at offices of Atkinson, Tyrell st, Bradford

Pennell, William, Dudley, Worcester, Licensed Victualler. Nov 21 at 11 at offices of Whitehouse, Castle st, Dudley

Pheasant, Henry, Throckingham, Lincoln, Farmer. Nov 23 at 11 at the Fortescue Arms Inn, Billingborough. Law, Stamford

Pickering, Samuel Whaley, Manchester, Chemist. Nov 22 at 3 at offices of Shipley, Cooper st, Manchester

Reading, William, Aldbrough, Suffolk, Baker. Dec 1 at 2 at the East Suffolk Hotel, Aldbrough. Pollard, Ipswich

Reinhold, Hermann Adolph, W'lington st, Woolwich, Mechanician. Nov 28 at 3 at offices of Barrett and Patoy, London wall. Jenkins, Tavistock st, Strand

Rodds, John, Antrobus rd, Acton green, Builder. Nov 18 at 3 at offices of Clarke, Brompton rd, London

Roebuck, William Richardson, Gray's inn sq, no occupation. Nov 22 at 3 at offices of Duncan, Gracechurch buildings, Gracechurch st

Rose, James, Great Grimby, Lincoln, Painter. Nov 23 at 2 at offices of Masons, Victoria st south, Great Grimby

Royer, Richard John, Redcar, York, Baker. Nov 28 at 3 at offices of Bell, Church st, West Hartlepool

Russell, David, Bootle, nr Liverpool, Book-keeper. Nov 21 at 2 at offices of Williams, Lord st, Liverpool

Saul, Richard, Birkenhead, Cheshire, Tailor. Dec 1 at 3 at offices of Lowe, Castle st, Liverpool

Scott, George, Leeds, Cloth Merchant. Nov 22 at 3 at offices of Routh and Co, Park row, Leeds. Pullan

Seaton, Philip Richard, Mill st, Hanover sq, Upholsterer. Nov 29 at 12 at offices of Bridger and Collins, King William st

Senior, James, Dewsbury, Tailor. Nov 24 at 10.30 at offices of Ridgeway and Ridgway, Church st, Dewsbury

Sexton, Frederick, Great Dover st, Borough, Cabinet Manufacturer. Nov 23 at 2 at offices of Whittington and Son, Bishopsgate st without

Shaw, James, H'neley, York, Yarn Spinner. Nov 23 at 3 at offices of Leary and Co, Buxton rd, Huddersfield

Sims, Thomas Henry, Great Vine st, Regent st, Tailor. Nov 18 at 1 at offices of Mitchell, Argyl st, Regent st. Froggatt, Argyl st

Smith, Herbert, Market rd, Pockham rye, Commercial Traveller. Nov 23 at 2 at offices of Kings, North buildings, Finsbury circus

Sniesz, John, Twining, Worcester, Land Agent's Assistant. Nov 20 at the Swan Hotel, Tewkesbury, in lieu of the place originally named

Sofeld, Thomas William, Berkeley st, Rotherhithe, Draper. Nov 29 at 2 at offices of James, Ludgate hill. Morris, Paternoster row

Speedy, Henry, Brown st, Edgware rd, Licensed Victualler. Dec 1 at 2 at offices of Layton and Co, Budge row

Stewart, Andrew Hamilton, Balsall Heath, Worcester, out of business. Nov 20 at 2 at the Imperial Hotel, Piccadilly, Manchester. East, Birmingham

Suthern, Robert, Newbottle, Durham, Licensed Victualler. Nov 29 at 11 at offices of Brignall, jun, Durham

Thompson, Edward, Lee Moor, York, General Dealer. Nov 20 at 3 at offices of Brooks, Bond st, Leeds

Tofield, Daniel, Ellsworth, Bucks, Shop Keeper. Nov 25 at 3.30 at Reader and Son's Auction Rooms, Temple st, Aylesbury. Reader, Gray's inn sq

Van Baerle, William Hislop, Golden sq, Government Clerk. Nov 23 at 1 at Dick's Coffee House, Fleet st. Maynard, Clifford's inn

Wagstaffe, Thomas Henry, Byers green, Durham, Surgeon. Nov 24 at 3 at offices of Eldon, Royal arcade, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Walker, Arthur, Madresfield, Worcester, Farmer. Nov 22 at 12 at offices of Hill, Foregate st, Worcester

Watmouth, John, Covenham, Lincoln, Farmer. Nov 23 at 11 at offices of Grange and Winttingham, West 8 Mary's gate, Great Grimby

Westlake, William, Exeter, Builder. Nov 21 at 13 at offices of Harris, Gander st, Exeter. Fryer

Whittaker, John, Bury, Lancashire, Beer-seller. Nov 22 at 3 at offices of Anderson, Garden st, Bury

Williams, John Trevor, and John John Owens, Milcom, Cumberland, Builders. Nov 29 at 1 at the Station Hotel, Milcom. Park, Barrow-in-Furness

Wilson, Charles, Carlisle, Cumberland, Innkeeper. Nov 27 at 11 at offices of Dobinson and Watson, Bank st, Carlisle

Wilson, William, Lomwoor, York, Worsted Spinner. Nov 24 at 3 at offices of Watson and Dicksons, Market st, Bradford

Wilson, William, Sunderland, Durham, Tailor. Nov 24 at 12 at offices of Lawson and Robinson, Villiers st, Sunderland

Wincom, Richard Wavell, Bognor, Sussex, Grocer. Nov 22 at 12 at offices of Tippetts and Co, Carter lane, Doctors' commons

Woolley, Robert, James rd, Caledonian rd, out of business. Nov 23 at 3 at offices of Holloway, Ball's Pond rd, Islington. Fenton  
Tues-day, Nov. 14, 1876.

Almond, Elizabeth, Congleton, Cheshire, Milliner. Nov 22 at 11 at offices of Poulton, Market st, Crewe

Barnes, Samuel, Onestwyd Aston. Salop, Innkeeper. Nov 27 at 12 at offices of Fisher and Hodges, Newport

Baxter, John, Cambridge, Saddler. Nov 30 at 11 at 145, Cheapside.

Ellison and Burrows, Cambridge

Bast, John Henry, Llanconnet, Cornwall, Gas Engineer. Nov 28 at 11 at offices of Square, George st, Plymouth

Bickerton, Enoch, Longton, Stafford, Bootmaker. Nov 23 at 3 at offices of Kent, Market st, Longton

Bonner, William, Aston, nr Birmingham, Commercial Traveller. Nov 28 at 2 at offices of Johnson and Co, Waterloo st, Birmingham

Brett, Robert, Finch, Lowestoft, Builder. Dec 1 at 12 at offices of Seago, High st, Lowestoft

Briggs, John, Smith, Cussetford, York, Grocer. Nov 27 at 1 at the Royal Hotel, Wakefield, Boulton, Pontefract

Broadbent, John, Halifax, Coal Merchant. Nov 24 at 4 at offices of Storey, King Cross st, Halifax

Brooke, William, Ousest common, York, Flock Manufacturer. Nov 27 at 2 at offices of Stewart and Son, Bank buildings, Westgate, Wakefield

Brown, James Honeyman, Wardour st, Soho, Picture Frame Manufacturer. Nov 30 at 3 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Cordwell and Scott, Meigate st

Burton, Robert, Barn Common, York, Farmer. Nov 24 at 2 at offices of Burton, New lane, Selby

Cart, John, Almonrd rd, Islington, Warehouseman's Assistant. Nov 28 at 3 at offices of Lovering and Co, Gresham st. Rooks and Co, King st, Cheapside

Clarke, James, Burton-on-Trent, Coal Merchant. Nov 25 at 11 at the Midland Hotel, Station st, Burton-on-Trent. Wilson, Burton-on-Trent

Collins, Henry, Old Shildon, Durham, Ironmonger. Nov 28 at 12 at offices of Maw, Jun, High Bonagate, Bishop Auckland

Davies, Edward William, Denbigh, Gent. Nov 25 at 1 at the Blossoms Hotel, Chester. Sherratt, Wrexham

Deas, John, Llanrha, Glamorgan, Grocer. Nov 23 at 12 at offices of Beddoes, Merthyr Tydfil

De Little, Frederick, Robt, York, Printer. Nov 28 at 2 at offices of Wilkinson, St Helen's sq, York

Drayson, Valentine, Gravesend, Grocer. Nov 30 at 3 at 145, Cheapside. Sophier, Coleman st

Earle, Henry, Buckingham Palace rd, Pimlico, Lims Merchant. Nov 30 at 10 at offices of Duignan and Sonies, Bedford row

Emanuel, John Herbert, Oxford st, Tailor. Dec 2 at 2 at offices of of Froggatt, Argyll st, Regent st

Everitt, William, Birmingham, Draper. Nov 27 at 11 at offices of Rowlands, Ann st, Birmingham

Flavel, Rev John Webb, R dington, Norfolk. Nov 24 at 12 at offices of Stanley, Bank plain, Norwich

Gardner, John Myers, Leeds, Linendrapers. Nov 30 at 2 at the Queen's Hotel, Wellington st, Leeds. Ridler

Gill, James, Halifax, Carver. Nov 27 at 12 at offices of Longbottom, Northgate chambers, Halifax

Gilmour, John, Whitehaven, Fruit Dealer. Dec 4 at 3 at offices of Alter, New Lowther st, Whitehaven

Graham, Joseph, Birmingham, Tobacconist. Nov 27 at 3 at offices of Seller and Bickley, Bennett's hill, Birmingham

Gray, Thomas, Walth, York, Joiner. Nov 28 at 3 at the Law Society's Rooms, Aldine court, High st, Sheffield. Berdekin and Co, Eastman's, William, Florence rd, New Cross rd, Mercantile Clerk. Nov 27 at 11 at offices of Lockyer, Deptford bridge

Hardy, Thomas, Woodnewton, Northampton, Farmer. Nov 23 at 12 at the Town Hall, Oundle. Sherard, Oundle

Harley, William, and James Hird, Halifax, Woolstaplers. Nov 27 at 1 at offices of Bo-cock, Silver st, Halifax

Harvell, Ebenezer James, Dalton lane, Grocer. Nov 23 at 3 at offices of Belgrave, Semerford grove, Stoke Newington

Hartley, Jonathan, Ely, Hertford, General Shopkeeper. Nov 23 at 3 at offices of Gostly, Cambridge terrace, Hyde park

Hatcher, William Edward, Horse-rye rd, Westminster, Printer. Nov 25 at 2 at offices of Willis, St Martin's court, Leicester sq

Hawley, Thomas, Leeds, Smith. Nov 27 at 2 at offices of Harle, Bank st, Leeds

Hewlett, George, Jun, Blandford Forum, Dorset, Fishmonger. Dec 4 at 11 at the Griffin's Arms Inn, Wimborne Minster. Atkinson, Blandford Forum

Hicks, Thomas Holland, Keynham, Somerset, Harnessmaker. Nov 25 at 12 at offices of Fricks and Co, City chambers, Nicholas st, Bristol. Clifton, Bristol

Higgins, Edward, Bournemouth, Boot Dealer. Nov 25 at 12 at offices of Nicholson, Railway approach, London bridge. Grueber, Railway approach

Hiron, William, Lowestoft, Builder. Nov 29 at 12 at offices of Seago, High st, Lowestoft

Hoson, Thomas, Brad ford, Mil iner. Nov 30 at 4 at offices of Atkinson, Tyrel st, Bradford

Huxley, Richard, Tottenham court rd, Earthenware Dealer. Nov 30 at 3 at the Law Institution, Chancery lane. Prior and Co, Lincoln's Inn fields

Jebber, Foster, Aston villas, Lavender hill, Wandsworth, Commercial Traveller. Nov 25 at 12 at offices of Gessment, New Broad st

Jenner, Walter, Rotherfield, Sussex, Farmer. Nov 24 at 4 at offices of Stone and Simpson, Church st, Tunbridge Wells

Jennings, Robert, Manchester, Fruitlarer. Nov 24 at 3 at offices of Horner, St Mary st, Manchester

Johnson, Joseph, Stoke-noburch, Oxford, Chair Turner. Nov 27 at 3 at the King's Arms Hotel, Stokenchurch. Rawson, Great Marlow

Johnson, Thomas, Manchester, Bookseller. Nov 27 at 3 at offices of Addleshaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester

Jones, George, Leeds, Painter. Nov 24 at 11 at offices of Dalton, Alton st, Leeds

Jones, William, Jun, Cinderford, Gloucester, Contractor. Nov 30 at 2.30 at the Swan Hotel, Cinderford. David, Newport

Kent, Christopher David, Red Lion st, Holborn, Watchmaker. Dec 4 at 2 at offices of Ousegde, Clifford's inn, Fleet st

Lawrence, Thomas, Birmingham, Retail Brewer. Nov 23 at offices of East, Eldon chambers, Cherry st, Birmingham

Longden, Thomas Wilson, Manchester, Tailor. Dec 4 at 11 at offices of Whitt, King st, Manchester. Bowden, Manchester

McNeillage, Edward, Clay Hall place, Old Ford, Bow, Coach Builder. Nov 21 at 3 at offices of Godfrey, Gresham buildings, Basinghall st.

Watson, Guildhall yard

Marham, William John, Cambridge, Leather Merchant. Nov 25 at 3 at offices of Barlow and Co, St Andrew's st, Cambridge

Marsh, Thomas, Newport, Salop, Painter. Nov 24 at 10 at offices of Liddle, Newport

Merson, William, Chelmsford, Auctioneer. Nov 27 at 11 at offices of Jones, Tindal sq, Chelmsford

Martin, William, Heckmondwike, York, Grocer. Nov 27 at 10.30 at offices of Woeler, Exchange buildings, Batley

Mathison, Robert, Berwick-upon-Tweed, Cooper. Nov 27 at 2 at offices of Weddells, Berwick-upon-Tweed

Mattings, Joseph, Longcot, Berks, out of business. Nov 24 at 12 at the Junction Hotel, Uffington Railway Station. Foreman, Swindon

Maddows, Henry, Harborough Magna, Warwick, Farmer. Nov 28 at 4 at the Windmill Inn, North st, Rugby. Homer, Coventry

Morgan, James, Lmpeter, Carligan, Innkeeper. Nov 27 at 3 at offices of Lloyd, High st, Lmpeter

Motley, John Thomas, Lincoln, Furniture Broker. Nov 27 at 11 at offices of Durance, Mint lane, Lincoln

Muhlin, Charles Whitley, Liverpool, Builder. Nov 27 at 2 at the Liverpool Law Association, Cook st, Liverpool. Frogdham and Nicholson, Liverpool

Manson, Rowell Carter, Denman st, Southwark, Merchant. Dec 5 at 3 at offices of Waddell and Co, Queen Victoria st. Vallance and Vallance, Essex st, Strand

Nuttall, Hampson Wood, Radcliffe, Lancashire, Pork Butcher. Nov 28 at 3 at offices of Scowcroft, Town Hall sq, Bolton

Osgood, William, Southampton, General Dealer. Nov 28 at 2 at offices of Kilby, Portland st, Southampton

Parkin, Jonathan, Leicester, Agent. Nov 27 at 3 at offices of Wright, Gallowtree gate, Leicester

Partridge, Edward, Great Yarmouth, Fish Merchant. Dec 5 at 12 at offices of Dyer, King st, Great Yarmouth

Pass, Joseph, Birmingham, Builder. Nov 23 at 3 at offices of Quishe, Cannon st, Birmingham

Peacock, Robert, Killingworth, Northumberland, Grocer. Nov 25 at 11 at offices of Johnstone, Pilgrim st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Pearce, Robert Austine, Gower st, Wise Merchant. Dec 4 at 4 at offices of Ball and Co, Gresham buildings, Basinghall st. Carter, Old Jewry chambers

Pearson, James, Heaton Norris, Lancashire, out of business. Dec 1 at 4 at offices of Best, Lower Kint st, Manchester

Philips, Philip, Aberdare, Glamorgan, Grocer. Nov 25 at 12 at offices of Sedden, Aberdare

Pomfret, William, Blackburn, Lancashire, Tinner. Nov 30 at 12 at the Montague Arms, King st, Blackburn. Whalley, Accrington

Portch, Frederick, Phoenix st, Somers town, Grocer. Nov 28 at 11 at offices of Breton, Southampton row, Holborn

Preasey, George, Killmarck, Derby, Tailor. Nov 24 at 2 at offices of Wake, Castle court, King st, Sheffield

Price, Watkin, Melincourt, nr Resolven, Glamorgan, Publican. Nov 27 at 3 at offices of Charles, Parade, Neath

Richards, William, Clareville grove, Hereford sq, South Kensington, Carpenter. Nov 25 at 11 at offices of Berridge, Duke st, Manchester

Richmond, George, Southampton, Tailor. Nov 25 at 2 at offices of Robins, Port and st, Southampton

Reay, John, Lothouse, York, Miner. Nov 23 at 19 at the Wellington Hotel, Albert rd, Middlesborough. Teale, Middlesborough

Risque, William, Nunhead, Peckham rye, Coal Merchant. Nov 27 at 2 at offices of Marlow, Cross st, Manchester

Salmon, Matthew, Nottingham, Grocer. Dec 5 at 12 at offices of Brights, Town Club chambers, Wheeler gate, Nottingham

Salter, Jonathan, Hampstead rd, Florist. Nov 29 at 2 at offices of Smith, Chancery lane

Schroder, Henry, Bermondsey New rd, Tripe Dresser. Nov 27 at 3 at offices of Chispefield, Trinity st, Southwark

Shearer, Samuel, Leeds, Butcher. Nov 25 at 12 at offices of Pullan, Bank chambers, Park row, Leeds

Simons, Miriam, Birmingham, out of business. Nov 24 at 11 at offices of Harvard, Waterloo st, Birmingham

Small, Frederick, Penhill Farm, Tenterden, Kent, Farmer. Nov 24 at 3 at the White Lion Hotel, Tenterden

Smith, Henry Francis, Lewisham, Builder. Nov 29 at 2 at offices of Arnold, Finsbury pavement

Smith, James, High st, Marylebone, Licensed Victualler. Nov 20 at 2 at offices of Pain, Marylebone rd

Sommerville, William, and Thomas Sommerville, Manchester, Cabinet Makers. Nov 25 at 3 at 44, Varley st, Oldham rd, Manchester

Sicane, Thomas, Harborough Magna, Warwick, Farmer. Nov 23 at 4 at the Windmill Inn, North st, Rugby. Homer, Coventry

Swift, Levi, Bradford, Painter. Nov 29 at 4 at offices of Atkinson, Tyrel st, Bradford

Taylor, Edward Alfred, Woking, Surrey, Grocer's Assistant. Nov 30 at 3 at the County and Borough Hall, Guildford. Geach, Guildford

Thomas, Edward, Merthyr Tydfil, Glamorgan, Grocer. Dec 1 at 3 at offices of Morgan and Co, Victoria st, Merthyr Tydfil

Thompson, George Maurice, Cambridge, Upholsterer. Nov 30 at 2 at 145, Cheapside. Ellison and Burrows, Cambridge

Thomson, Jessie Miller, Gloucester place, Hyde park, Schoolmistress. Nov 21 at 2.30 at offices of Wilson and Co, Cophall buildings

Walker, Enoch, Burslem, Stafford, Ginger Beer Manufacturer. Nov 23 at 11 at offices of Julian, Queen's chambers, Burslem

Waterhouse, Henry, Burslem, Lancashire, Machine Broker. Nov 22 at 3 at offices of Read, Hargreaves st, Burslem

Weeks, James, Bath, Butcher. Nov 27 at 11 at offices of Simmons and Clark, Manners st, Bath

Wheatley, Thomas, Coventry, Licensed Victualler. Nov 24 at 12 at 17, Little Park st, Coventry. Homer, Coventry

Whitman, Frederick John, Henry Morris Hicks, and Henry Frederick Whitman, Little Queen st, High Holborn, Lithographers. Nov 30 at 2 at offices of Scott, College hill, Cannon st



Wilkinson, Enoch, Accrington, Flagger. Nov 28 at 3 at the Derby Hotel, St James st, Accrington. Satchell, Burnley  
 Wilkinson, William, and Joseph Norbury, Stanningley, Leeds, Oil Extractors. Nov 27 at 11 at offices of Middleton and Sons, Park row, Leeds  
 Williams, John, Llanelli, Carmarthen. Licensed Victualler. Nov 25 at 10.30 at offices of Green and Griffiths, St Mary st, Carmarthen

#### CHARLEY'S REAL PROPERTY ACTS.—Third Edition.

Just published, demy 12mo, price 12s., cloth.

**THE REAL PROPERTY ACTS, 1874, 1875, and 1876;** 37 & 38 Vict. cc. 33, 37, 57, 78 (Settled Estates Act, Powers Law Amendment Act, Limitation Act, and Vendor and Purchaser Act, 1874); 38 & 39 Vict. c. 87 (Land Transfer Act, 1875); 39 & 40 Vict. cc. 1, 30 (Partition Act and Settled Estates Act, 1876). With Explanatory Notes. Third Edition. By WILLIAM THOMAS CHARLEY, D.C.L., M.P., of the Inner Temple, Esq., Barrister-at-Law (late Exhibitor of the Council of Legal Education).

London: H. SWEET, 3, Chancery-lane, Law Publisher.

#### PRACTICE at JUDGES' CHAMBERS and DISTRICT REGISTRIES.

Just published, post 8vo, price 10s., cloth.

**THE PRACTICE OF THE JUDGES' CHAMBERS** (Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer Divisions), and in the District Registries under the Supreme Court of Judicature Acts of 1873, 1875, and other Statutes; with an Appendix of the Judicature Acts, and the Rules and Orders to Form, 1876. By WILLIAM E. COE, Principal Clerk to the Hon. Mr. Justice Lush.

London: H. SWEET, 3, Chancery-lane, Law Publisher.

Just published, price 6s. 6d., sewed.

**THE STATUTES OF PRACTICAL UTILITY** in the Civil and Criminal Administration of Justice passed 39 & 40 Victoria (1876). Alphabetically arranged, with notes thereon, and a copious index. By HORATIO LLOYD, Esq., Judge of County Courts (forming Vol. II., No. IV., of the Annual Continuation of Chitty's Statutes).

London: H. SWEET, 3, Chancery-lane; STEVENS & SONS, 119, Chancery-lane.

**MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON & FARMER'S** LIST OF ESTATES and HOUSES to be SOLD or LET, including Landed Estates, Town and Country Residences, Hunting and Shooting Quarters, Farms, Ground Rents, Rent Charges, House Property and Investments generally, is published on the first day of each month, and may be obtained, free of charge, at their offices, 80, Chesapeake, E.C.; or will be sent by post in return for two stamps.—Particulars for insertion should be received not later than four days previous to the end of the preceding month.

#### WHITECHAPEL.

Near the junction of Whitechapel High-street, and Commercial-road east.—An important Freehold Property, let at £210 per annum, and occupying a valuable and extensive site, which, upon the expiration of the present leases, will be very eligible for the erection of modern manufacturing premises, warehouses, model lodging-houses, or other buildings.

**MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON, & FARMER** will SELL, at the MART, on TUESDAY, DECEMBER 2, at TWO, in One Lot, the valuable FREEHOLD PROPERTY, Nos. 114a and 114b, Back Church-lane, Whitechapel, comprising a spacious two-story brick building, with workshop adjoining, now occupied as a cooperage; large open yards, stabling, dwellings, &c., the whole embracing an area of about 9,500 ft. super., with a frontage of about 106 ft. Sin. to Back Church-lane and 62 ft. 6 in. to Batty's-gardens. A portion of the premises is let on lease to Mr. James Miller for 21 years from Christmas, 1874 (determinable by the lessee at the end of the first 7 or 14 years), at a rental of £150 per annum; and the remainder to Messrs. Venables & Sons, for 21 years from Lady-day, 1872, at £60 per annum.

Particulars of Messrs. BELL, BRODRICK, & GRAY, Solicitors, 9, Bow Churchyard; and of the Auctioneers, 80, Chesapeake.

#### PRELIMINARY ADVERTISEMENT.

Serjeants'-inn and Serjeants'-inn Hall, Chancery-lane, in the City of London, the property of the Hon. Society of Judges and Serjeants-at-Law, a valuable and important freehold property, with an indefeasible title under the Land Transfer Act. Nos. 1, 2, and 3, Serjeants'-inn, comprising a substantial pile of buildings of four floors, the principal portion being used by the Government and occupied by the Masters of the Common Pleas; the remainder is let in suites of offices, and producing at the present very inadequate rentals upwards of £1,200 per annum. Serjeants'-inn Hall consists of a lofty and spacious dining-hall, chapel, coffee-room, robing-room, kitchen, capital wine and other cellars, &c. The premises have a frontage to Chancery-lane of 130 feet, occupy the important area of about 17,000 superficial feet, and being in close proximity to the New Law Courts offer unusual facilities for the erection of an institution or club-house, or they may be continued as offices, by which a very large increase in rental may with certainty be secured.

**MESSRS. NORTON, TRIST, WATNEY, & CO.** are instructed to offer for SALE, in the Spring of next year, the above important FREEHOLD PROPERTY.

Particulars and plans (when ready) may be had of

Messrs. GREGORY, ROWCLIFFE, & RAWLE, Solicitors, 1, Bedford-row, W.C.; and of the Auctioneers, No. 62, Old Broad-street, E.C.

Freehold Ground-rent of £40, secured on Nos. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, Marion-grove, Collingwood-road, Walthamstow, the rack rental of which amount to a net £150 per annum. The property is close to the station, and always commands tenants.

**MR. EDMUND W. RICHARDSON** will SELL, by AUCTION, at the MART, Tokenbury-yard, City, on WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 28th, at TWO o'clock precisely, the above sound FREEHOLD INVESTMENT.

Particulars, with conditions of sale, may be obtained at the Mart; of J. M'DIARMID, Esq., Solicitor, 10, Old Jewry-chambers, E.C.; and at the Auctioneer's offices, 50, Finsbury-square, London.

#### EDE AND SON.

ROBE MAKERS.

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench Corporation of London, &c.

**SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS.**

BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSEL'S DITTO.

**CORPORATION ROBES, UNIVERSITY & CLERGY GOWNS, &c.** ESTABLISHED 1680.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

#### EVISON & BRIDGE,

22, CHANCERY-LANE, LONDON,

Law Stationers,  
 Printers, and Publishers of Law  
 Forms,

Have all the new Forms required by the Judicature Acts.

ALSO A GREAT VARIETY OF

BANKRUPTCY,  
 CONVEYANCING,

PROBATE, AND  
 GENERAL FORMS.

Where 100 copies of any form ordered, the solicitor's name, address, &c., inserted without extra charge.

Statements, Affidavits, &c., printed in correct style with expedition and accuracy.

#### THOMAS SCOTT,

1, WARWICK COURT, HOLBORN,  
 PRINTER AND PUBLISHER

OF THE

**CHANCERY AND COMMON LAW PUBLICATIONS.**

(By Appointment.)

**THE DAILY CAUSE LISTS** Printed every Day at the rising of the Courts, and delivered to Subscribers together with the SITTINGS PAPERS, GENERAL and SUPPLEMENTAL CAUSE LISTS, ROTA PAPERS, and TRANSCRIPTS of CAUSES. Subscription, £2 2s. per annum; beyond one sale from office, £5 3s.

#### YATES & ALEXANDER,

PRINTERS, LITHOGRAPHERS, STATIONERS,  
 ETC.

CHANCERY-BUILDINGS, 23, CHANCERY-LANE,  
 LONDON.

Every description of Printing.

Judicature Affidavits  
 Appeals  
 Parliamentary Minutes  
 Books  
 Pamphlets  
 Reports  
 Rules

Catalogues  
 Prospectuses  
 Magazines  
 Newspapers  
 Circulars  
 Posters  
 Handbills, &c., &c.

#### The Companies Acts, 1862 & 1867.

Every requisite under the above Acts supplied on the shortest notice

The BOOKS and FORMS kept in stock for immediate use MEMORANDA and ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION speedily printed in the proper form for registration and distribution. SHARE CERTIFICATES, DEBENTURES, &c., engraved and printed. OFFICIAL SEALS designed and executed. No charge for sketches. Companies Fee Stamps Railway Registration Forms.

Solicitors' Account Books.

**RICHARD FLINT & CO.**

(Late ASH & FLINT.)

Stationers, Printers, Engravers, Registration Agents, &c., 40, Fleet-street, London, E.C. (corner of Serjeants'-inn). Annual and other Returns Stamped and Filed.